

lution 290, Seventy-sixth Congress; without amendment (Rept. No. 251). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. BLOOM: Committee on Foreign Affairs. Senate Concurrent Resolution 9. Concurrent resolution condemning outrages inflicted upon civilians in the Nazi occupied countries and favoring punishment of persons responsible therefor; without amendment (Rept. No. 252). Referred to the House Calendar.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. HOWELL:

H. R. 2201. A bill providing for an Assistant Secretary of Commerce for small business; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. LANE:

H. R. 2202. A bill to increase the amount of Federal aid to State or Territorial homes for the support of disabled soldiers and sailors of the United States; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. O'HARA:

H. R. 2203. A bill to amend the Judicial Code in respect to the original jurisdiction of the district courts of the United States in certain cases, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. RANKIN:

H. R. 2204. A bill relating to pay, allowances, and insurance for members of the land or naval forces training to be pilots under the Civilian Pilot Training Act of 1939; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. ROWE:

H. R. 2205. A bill to amend the act entitled "An act to incorporate the Hungarian Reformed Federation of America," approved March 2, 1907, so as to permit such federation to extend certain benefits to all its members; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. STEAGALL:

H. R. 2206. A bill to amend the National Housing Act, as now or hereafter amended, so as to give protection to persons in military service, and their dependents, as to certain mortgages; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. DICKSTEIN:

H. R. 2207. A bill to amend the Nationality Act of 1940; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. MCCORMACK:

H. R. 2208. A bill to promote the national defense and to facilitate and protect the transport of materials and supplies needful to the Military Establishment and essential to domestic requirements through safe and adequate inland waterways, by the immediate authorization of the construction of the New York Bay-Delaware River section of the Atlantic Intracoastal Waterway; to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

By Mr. PETERSON of Florida:

H. R. 2209. A bill to cover the positions of registers of the district land offices into the classified civil service and to fix the compensation thereof; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

H. R. 2210. A bill to fix the compensation of registers of the district land offices in accordance with the Classification Act of 1923, as amended; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

By Mr. PATMAN:

H. J. Res. 99. Joint resolution to permit retailers to combine in negotiating purchases from suppliers; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DOUGHTON:

H. J. Res. 100. Joint resolution extending the time within which certain acts under

the Internal Revenue Code are required to be performed; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. DIRKSEN:

H. Res. 171. Resolution to establish a special committee to be known as the Committee on Post-War Economic Policy and Planning; to the Committee on Rules.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BARRY:

H. R. 2211. A bill for the relief of Francesco Antonio Patata; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. BLAND:

H. R. 2212. A bill for the relief of Clarence Waverly Morgan; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. CALVIN D. JOHNSON:

H. R. 2213. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Agnes Wolters; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. McWILLIAMS:

H. R. 2214. A bill for the relief of the East Coast Ship and Yacht Corporation, of Noank, Conn.; to the Committee on Claims.

H. R. 2215. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Alice V. Jones; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. REECE of Tennessee:

H. R. 2216. A bill for the relief of Solon P. Haun; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. SCHWABE:

H. R. 2217. A bill granting a pension to Ethel Forbes; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

SENATE

WEDNESDAY, MARCH 17, 1943

(Legislative day of Tuesday, March 9, 1943)

The Senate met at 11 o'clock a. m., on the expiration of the recess.

Rev. Hunter M. Lewis, B. D., associate minister, Church of the Epiphany, Washington, D. C., offered the following prayer:

O Eternal God, who in times past didst lead our forefathers from lands of oppression, and open before them in the wilderness a new land which by Thy gracious providence has become great among the nations: We beseech Thee to continue thy loving kindness to us, that in these days of strife and strain we lose not the vision of freedom, justice, and equality which Thou didst reveal to them. Guide, we pray Thee, all those to whom Thou hast committed the Government of our Nation, and grant to them at this time special gifts of wisdom and understanding, of counsel and of strength.

Bless all who labor in field and factory, in office and home for our country's welfare. May they labor for the work's sake without undue thought of gain, unspoiled by the increase of income, seeking to give the best that is in them.

And stretch forth, we beseech Thee, Thine almighty arm to strengthen and protect the defenders of our country, wherever they may serve at home or abroad, on land, sea, or in the air. Bless them and the cause in which we send them forth. Endue them with courage and loyalty, with patience, fortitude and endurance, and lead them to Thine own

victory of righteousness and peace. We ask it all in the name and for the sake of Jesus Christ our Lord. Amen.

NAMING A PRESIDING OFFICER

The Secretary (Edwin A. Halsey) read the following letter:

UNITED STATES SENATE,
PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE,
Washington, D. C., March 17, 1943.

To the Senate:

Being temporarily absent from the Senate, I appoint Hon. SCOTT W. LUCAS, a Senator from the State of Illinois, to perform the duties of the Chair during my absence.

CARTER GLASS,
President pro tempore.

Mr. LUCAS thereupon took the chair as Acting President pro tempore.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. CLARK of Missouri, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of the calendar day Tuesday, March 16, 1943, was dispensed with, and the Journal was approved.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate the following letters, which were referred as indicated:

REPORT OF SOCIAL SECURITY BOARD

A letter from the Administrator of the Federal Security Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the seventh annual report of the Social Security Board for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1942 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Finance.

REPORT OF OPERATIONS OF OFFICE OF THE DISTRICT RENT CONTROL ADMINISTRATOR

A letter from the president of the Board of Commissioners of the District of Columbia, transmitting, pursuant to law, the second semiannual report of the operations of the Office of Administrator of Rent Control of the District of Columbia, covering the period July 1, 1942, to December 31, 1942 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

DISPOSITION OF EXECUTIVE PAPERS

A letter from the Archivist of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a list of papers and documents on the files of the Departments of War, Navy (3), Interior, Agriculture (3), and Commerce; Federal Works Agency (2), The National Archives, and the District Court of the Northern District of California which are not needed in the conduct of business and have no permanent value or historical interest, and requesting action looking to their disposition (with accompanying papers); to a Joint Select Committee on the Disposition of Papers in the Executive Departments.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore appointed Mr. BARKLEY and Mr. BREWSTER members of the committee on the part of the Senate.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

Petitions, etc., were laid before the Senate, or presented, and referred as indicated:

By the ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore:

A resolution of Hollywood Parlor, No. 196, Native Sons of the Golden West, of Los Angeles, Calif., protesting against the formation of a Japanese unit of the United States Army; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

A resolution of the House of Representatives of the State of Texas; to the Committee on Finance:

"Whereas the people of Texas are required to pay Federal taxes to support Federal social-security programs for maternal and child-health services in all the States; and

"Whereas the State of Texas, in order to participate in the Federal program, is required to subscribe to certain conditions laid down in the Federal Social Security Act, including State plans drawn on a Federal pattern; and

"Whereas under the provisions of title V of the Social Security Act the Texas State plans, in order to receive the approval of the Federal administrative agency for participation in the maternal and child-health program, are required to embrace all and such policies, measures, and means in carrying out the State program as will currently satisfy the desires of the Federal Children's Bureau as to propriety and efficiency (title V, sec. 503 (a), 3), among which is the requirement that the State of Texas shall subscribe to and practice a program which denies the right of choice of physician to the intended beneficiaries of the Texas maternal and child-health program (if the State is to participate in the Federal social-security funds for State plans, which its people have already paid for in Federal taxes); and

"Whereas the latest example of the requirement by the Children's Bureau that choice of physician shall be surrendered in order to participate in the Federal program is represented in the subsidy offered by the Children's Bureau under the Federal Social Security Act for the purpose of implementing professional medical services and care to the wives and families of servicemen as follows: That the State plan shall restrict the expenditure of any of the funds for physicians' services except for the use of doctors approved by the American Medical Association (May 1, 1942, memorandum to State health agencies from the Director, Division of Health Services, Children's Bureau, U. S. Department of Labor, subject Medical and Hospital Obstetric and Pediatric Care for Wives and Infants of Men in Military Service: '3. Standards of medical care: Medical care provided under the plan should be authorized by the State health agency only when the attending physician is licensed to practice in the State and is a graduate of a medical school approved by the council on medical education of the American Medical Association'); and

"Whereas the State of Texas exacts a high standard of proficiency in all the practitioners of the healing art who are licensed to practice, and there are numerous such legally licensed practitioners who belong to schools of medicine that are not affiliated with the American Medical Association and are not required to be so affiliated under the Texas law; and

"Whereas freedom of choice of physician is an integral part of the Texas Constitution in that it specifically provides against the making of any Texas law which gives any preference to any school of medicine, regardless of the affiliation or nonaffiliation of any such school (Texas Constitution, art. XVI, sec. 31); and

"Whereas the Social Security act in effect, places the fitness and qualification of a physician in the Council on Medical Education of the American Medical Association, which is un-American, undemocratic, and is the only profession that is licensed by the laws of various States in the United States, and controlled by a law, rule, or regulation of the Federal Government. This act denies to the taxpayers and citizens throughout the United States the right to choose their physician; and

"Whereas there are counties in the State of Texas, in which, if this rule is enforced, the wives and children of men now in the Army will be denied the services of a physician and

surgeon, as there are duly qualified, licensed, practicing physicians and surgeons who have been practicing for years, for whom the citizenship has the highest regard as to their ability and integrity, and they, although licensed and qualified, will not be eligible to render the services required: Therefore be it

"Resolved, That it is the sense of the House of Representatives of the State of Texas assembled at Austin, that the Congress should amend the Federal Social Security Act in such manner as to prevent the Federal administrative agencies, specifically the Children's Bureau, from any requirement, policy, or pressure involving coercion or inducement of the States to practice or sanction denial of choice of physician as a part of State plans necessary to participate in the Federal program of maternal and child health generally or services to the wives and children of servicemen in particular; and be it further

"Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be transmitted to Franklin D. Roosevelt, President of the United States; HENRY A. WALLACE, Vice President of the United States and President of the Senate; SAM RAYBURN, Speaker of the House of Representatives; and to the Senators and Congressmen from the State of Texas."

By Mr. VANDENBERG:

A telegram embodying a resolution adopted by Col. Francis Hamtramck Post, No. 1, P. L. A. V., at Hamtramck, Detroit, Mich., protesting against any proposed annexation of the eastern territories of the Republic of Poland and favoring full justice to Poland and the preservation of all Polish rights against aggression; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

By Mr. CAPPER:

A letter in the nature of a petition from the Altrusa Club, of Los Angeles, Calif., praying for the adoption of the so-called equal rights amendment to the Constitution; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

A petition of sundry citizens of Little River Kan., praying for the enactment of Senate bill 860, relating to the sale of alcoholic liquors to the members of the land and naval forces of the United States; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. McNARY:

A joint memorial of the Legislature of the State of Oregon; to the Committee on Commerce.

"House Joint Memorial 8

"To the honorable Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled:

"Whereas the Federal Government of the United States, through its Bonneville administration and other Federal agencies, has built and is operating the Bonneville Dam and the Grand Coulee Dam and an extensive system of transmission lines and plant equipment; and

"Whereas the Federal Government, through its Bonneville administration, is in the business of making and selling large quantities of electric energy; and

"Whereas these facilities owned by the Federal Government do replace or compete with existing facilities which are taxable in the States of Oregon and Washington and which are a substantial part of their tax structures; and

"Whereas to date no provision has been made for the payment by the Bonneville administration of any portion of its gross revenues to the States of Oregon and Washington in lieu of taxes, as has been provided in the acts which govern the Federal operations of Boulder Dam and the Tennessee Valley Authority: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the House of Representatives of the State of Oregon (the senate jointly concurring therein), That the Congress of the United States be, and it hereby is, memorialized to enact such legislation as will correct this inequity and will require of the Bonne-

ville administration a payment in lieu of taxes to the States of Oregon and Washington on a basis substantially equivalent to that which has been found proper in the operations of the Tennessee Valley Authority and Boulder Dam; and be it further

"Resolved, That a copy of this memorial be sent to United States Senators CHARLES L. McNARY and RUFUS C. HOLMAN, and to Congressmen JAMES W. MOTT, HOMER D. ANGELL, LOWELL STOCKMAN, and HARRIS ELLSWORTH, and also to the Senators and Congressmen from the State of Washington, with the request that they support legislation to make this memorial effective; and

"That the secretary of state of the State of Oregon be, and he hereby is, instructed to forward a certified copy of this memorial to the President of the United States, the President and Chief Clerk of the United States Senate, the Speaker and Chief Clerk of the House of Representatives of the United States, and to the Governor of the State of Washington and the president of the senate and speaker of the house of representatives of that State."

(The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore also laid before the Senate a joint memorial identical with the foregoing, which was referred to the Committee on Commerce.)

By Mr. WALSH (for himself and Mr. LODGE):

Two resolutions of the General Court of Massachusetts; to the Committee on Finance:

"Resolution memorializing the Congress of the United States to enact legislation substantially in accordance with the Ruml plan for the deferred collection of the income tax

"Resolved, That the General Court of Massachusetts respectfully urges the Congress of the United States to enact legislation substantially in accordance with the Ruml plan, so called; and be it further

"Resolved, That copies of these resolutions be sent by the State secretary to the Vice President of the United States, to the Speaker of the House of Representatives of the Congress, and to the Members of the Congress from Massachusetts."

"Resolution memorializing Congress to increase the bed capacity of the West Roxbury Veterans' Hospital

"Resolved, That the General Court of Massachusetts hereby urges upon the Congress of the United States the necessity for increasing without delay the capacity of the West Roxbury Veterans' Hospital to 2,000 beds, so as to meet the mounting hospital needs of the veterans in this area; and be it further

"Resolved, That copies of these resolutions be sent forthwith by the State secretary to the President of the United States, to the presiding officer of each branch of Congress, and to the Members thereof from this Commonwealth."

(The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate two resolutions identical with the foregoing, which were referred to the Committee on Finance.)

By Mr. WALSH (for himself and Mr. LODGE):

Two resolutions of the General Court of Massachusetts; to the Committee on the Judiciary:

"Resolution memorializing Congress to adopt an adequate antilynch law

"Resolved, That the General Court of Massachusetts hereby memorializes the Seventy-eighth Congress of the United States to adopt, and the President of the United States to sign, an adequate antilynch law which would enlist the powers of the Federal Government in learning the identity of, and prosecuting, those participating in lynch mobs, those responsible for inciting such mobs, and those local law enforcement officers who re-

main lax or passive while a lynching is committed; and be it further

"Resolved, That copies of these resolutions be sent forthwith by the State secretary to the President of the United States, to the presiding officer of each branch of Congress, and to the Members thereof from this Commonwealth."

"Resolution memorializing Congress to enact the anti-poll-tax bill, so-called

"Whereas many colored people are fighting in the armed forces of the United States to protect and preserve the principles of democracy for which the United Nations stand: Therefore be it

"Resolved That the General Court of Massachusetts hereby memorializes the Seventy-eighth Congress of the United States to enact, and the President of the United States to sign, the so-called anti-poll-tax bill to the end that millions of citizens of the United States residing in several of our Southern States shall have restored to them their democratic right to vote; and be it further

"Resolved That copies of these resolutions be sent forthwith by the State secretary to the President of the United States, to the presiding officer of each branch of Congress, and to the Members thereof from this Commonwealth."

(The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate two resolutions identical with the foregoing, which were referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.)

RESOLUTIONS OF VERMONT GENERAL ASSEMBLY—THE DAIRY INDUSTRY AND ALLOTMENTS OF FARM MACHINERY

Mr. AUSTIN. Mr. President, I offer for the Record two certified copies of resolutions adopted by the General Assembly of Vermont. Joint House Resolution 18 is entitled "Joint resolution relating to restrictions on the dairy industry during wartime," and

Joint House Resolution 26 is entitled "Joint resolution relating to wartime allotments of farm machinery."

Both these resolutions were approved by the Governor of Vermont on March 13, 1943.

Mr. President, I ask that the resolutions be referred to the appropriate committee and printed in the Record.

There being no objection, the resolutions were referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry and ordered to be printed in the Record, under the rule, as follows:

Whereas the cooperation of all agencies, Federal and State, and individuals in the several States has been, and is being, urged for the most efficient prosecution of the war; and

Whereas one of the factors most essential to the successful prosecution of the war is the maximum production possible of dairy products for our armed forces and allies and for the citizenry of the Allied Nations; and

Whereas the desired result can be achieved only by the cooperation of the boards of health of the several States, particularly those to which the greater portion of the dairy products of this State are shipped; and

Whereas the strict enforcement of the present requirements and restrictions of the boards of health will in many cases cause producing dairymen to reduce or sell their herds, and the proposed discontinuance of numerous creameries for the purported purpose of conserving manpower and supplies will tend, especially in what is known in the industry as a flush season, still more to handicap dairymen, because thereby the number of dairies per transporting truck, the number of stops and the time of loading and

unloading, will be greatly increased, thus necessitating the still greater increase in the length of the day of the producer, and for that reason a still greater reduction in available farm labor; and

Whereas the average dairy farmer is now forced to work a week of 75 or 80 hours and is unable to convert returned milk into butter, because of lack of time, labor, and equipment, necessitating the dumping of such returned milk: Therefore be it

Resolved by the senate and house of representatives, That the Secretary of Agriculture of the United States be, and he hereby is, respectfully urged to consider the following:

1. That the importance is the quality of milk and not the place of production;

2. That country dairy plants be allowed to extend the time for the reception of milk;

3. That no milk be rejected and returned to the producer unless it has been ascertained to be unsafe for human consumption;

4. That in cases where dairies are excluded for high bacteria count or other reasons inspectors of the board of health and other officials cooperate as far as possible and expedient with dairymen to ascertain and remedy the cause;

5. That owing to the extreme difficulty in obtaining farm labor, equipment, and materials, no new drastic regulations be imposed on dairymen during the present emergency;

6. That boards of health in jurisdictions where the dairy products of this State are used or consumed cooperate with producers of dairy products to the end that the supply of milk be maintained and so far as possible increased as required for the successful prosecution of the war; and be it further

Resolved, That the Honorable Secretary issue such orders and regulations as will insure the cooperation of all Federal agencies having jurisdiction as to dairy products and their production with boards of health and producers to the end that production be maintained and the needs of our armed forces and our population and those of our allies be met; and be it further

Resolved, That copies of this resolution be sent to the Honorable Claude R. Wickard, Secretary of Agriculture, to all members of the Vermont congressional delegation, the Boston City Board of Health and the New York City Board of Health.

Whereas one of Vermont's greatest contributions to winning the war is the willingness, ability, and natural instinct of her farmers to produce more food, the present real essential which would hasten the end of the war; and

Whereas food has virtually been the decisive factor in the successful prosecution of previous wars; and

Whereas the definite shortage of farm labor makes our farmer's need for farm machinery more essential than ever before in order to "raise more food and cattle"—the war cry from the Secretary of Agriculture and other Government officials responsible for the prosecution of the war; and

Whereas the allotted quota of farm machinery to each county is far below the actual need and should be at least doubled in amount: Therefore be it

Resolved by the senate and house of representatives, That the people of Vermont represented in this general assembly cannot too strongly impress upon the authorities in Washington who are responsible in setting the allotted quota of farm machinery of how inadequate the allotment to Vermont is in comparison to its actual needs; and be it further

Resolved, That Vermont's Representatives in Congress exert every effort to bring about an increase in the present allotment quota of at least double the quota already set; and be it further

Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be sent forthwith by the secretary of state to

Vermont's Representatives in the Congress of the United States.

RESOLUTION OF BELLVIEW GRANGE NO. 1655, FREDONIA, KANS.—FAIR PRICES FOR AGRICULTURAL PRODUCTS

Mr. CAPPER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to present and to have printed in the Record and appropriately referred a resolution recently adopted by the Bellview Grange No. 1655, Fredonia, Kans., in which they take a stand for fair prices which will guarantee cost of production as being an advantage over subsidies and parity payments.

There being no objection, the resolution was referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry and ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

BELLVIEW GRANGE, No. 1655,
PATRONS OF HUSBANDRY,
Fredonia, Kans., March 21, 1943.
Senator ARTHUR CAPPER,
Washington, D. C.:

The following resolution was passed by the Bellview Grange, No. 1655 on March 10, 1943, and ordered sent to our Members in Congress and the Secretary of Agriculture. We would like for you to give this favorable attention:

"Resolved, That the Bellview Grange is on record as being opposed to subsidies and special crop parity payments for agriculture but rather is in favor of fair prices which will guarantee cost of production and a fair profit for all farm commodities."

Fraternally,

Mrs. MARIE MYERS,
Secretary.

LETTER FROM WILLIAM W. DUNCAN—TAXES ON SMALL INCOMES

Mr. WALSH. Mr. President, I present a letter which I ask may be treated in the nature of a petition and referred to the Committee on Finance. I ask that it be read.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the letter presented by the Senator from Massachusetts will be referred to the Committee on Finance, and the clerk will read for the information of the Senate.

The legislative clerk read the letter, as follows:

THE EQUITABLE LIFE ASSURANCE
SOCIETY OF THE UNITED STATES,
Boston, Mass., March 5, 1943.
Senator DAVID I. WALSH,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR WALSH: I wrote you a letter last fall regarding the effect of the tax bill upon widows and retired people with small incomes.

I have just finished making quite a few income tax reports on this type of person, particularly those having incomes between \$800 and \$1,000 a year. If you will look at 1040A report, I believe you will find that such a widow with a \$950 income or \$81 a month has to pay a tax of \$71, and believe me, in every case that I have seen these people are struggling to maintain one room and some of the comforts of life to which they have been accustomed.

Will it not be possible for such person or persons to file a report and upon affidavit that their income is not earned and does not exceed, say \$1,000 single and \$1,500 married, to have the tax waived, as is done in Massachusetts?

Yours very truly,

WM. W. DUNCAN,
Supervisor.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

By Mr. LODGE, from the Committee on Military Affairs:

S. 886. A bill relating to the selective-service deferment, on occupational grounds, of persons employed by the Federal Government; without amendment (Rept. No. 120).

By Mr. CAPPER, from the Committee on Claims:

S. 241. A bill for the relief of Rachel Acerra; with an amendment (Rept. No. 121); and

H. R. 1279. A bill for the relief of Lee Watts; without amendment (Rept. No. 122).

BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION INTRODUCED

Bills and a joint resolution were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. BYRD:

S. 887. A bill conferring jurisdiction upon the United States District Court for the Western District of Virginia to hear, determine, and render judgment upon the claims of John Weakley and Rella Moyer; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma:

S. 888 (by request). A bill to establish a domestic allotment plan for basic agricultural commodities, to regulate commerce in such commodities, and to provide for the orderly marketing of such commodities at fair prices in interstate and foreign commerce; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

By Mr. NYE:

S. J. Res. 45. Joint resolution relating to emergency crop, seed, and feed loans and to regional agricultural credit corporation loans; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

ORGANIZATION OF UNITED NATIONS—AMENDMENT TO SENATE RESOLUTION 114

Mr. WILLIS. Mr. President, yesterday the junior Senator from Minnesota [Mr. BALL], for himself and on behalf of three other Senators, submitted Senate Resolution 114 providing as follows:

That the Senate advises that the United States take the initiative in calling meetings of representatives of the United Nations for the purpose of forming an organization of the United Nations with specific and limited authority—

as further set out in the resolution.

The inspiration of this resolution is without doubt the age-old longing for a wise and certain solution of mankind's desire for lasting peace. Surely it will be a sad commentary on the present generation which experienced a disastrous war a quarter of a century ago, a devastating depression growing out of that war, and which is again involved in a war of catastrophic proportions, if we cannot take some steps toward the goal of permanent peace. I have no intention at this time to comment further on the broad objectives of the resolution.

Mr. President, in our form of government there are certain limitations of the powers which were granted by the people to their Congress and to their Executive. Among these is the limitation that all treaties made with other nations must be with the advice and consent of the Senate. The Senator from Minne-

sota recognized that fact in the able address he made when he submitted the resolution. These limitations on the several branches of our Government must be recognized at every step of the way we take in our effort to reach the very laudable goal set forth.

Mr. President, the line of demarcation between what constitutes a treaty with other nations, which must have the approval of a two-thirds vote of the Senate, and agreements made by the Executive which have had only a majority vote of both Houses of Congress has, in late years, become a twilight zone of considerable area within which our efforts may be attended with confusion.

In entering upon a problem of such magnitude as that involved in the resolution submitted by the Senator from Minnesota, it is only the part of wisdom and practical expediency that the limitations upon those who conduct the negotiations on behalf of the United States shall be clearly defined. The people of the United States need the reassurance that their sacred rights will not be violated. Those who outline specifically the aspirations of the United States in this matter must bear in mind continually the limitations of their authority, and in that spirit of frankness only under which a sound and lasting understanding can be developed, the peoples of other nations should have plainly in their minds the same limitations.

Mr. President, I ask consent to present an amendment intended to be proposed by me to the resolution submitted by the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. BALL] and other Senators, being the resolution (S. Res. 114) favoring the organization of the United Nations to maintain peace, and ask that it be read.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The amendment of the Senator from Indiana will be read for the information of the Senate.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. At the end of the resolution it is proposed to insert the following new paragraph, as follows:

Any agreement concluded in accordance with the provisions of this resolution, on behalf of the Government of the United States with any other nation or any association of nations, shall not be binding upon the Government of the United States until a proposal of such agreement shall have been submitted to the United States Senate and concurred in by two-thirds of the Senators present.

Mr. WILLIS. Mr. President, I ask that the amendment be printed and referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the amendment will be received, printed, and referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations as requested by the Senator from Indiana.

SELECTION AND ESTABLISHMENT OF FEDERAL FIELD OFFICES (S. DOC. NO. 22)

Mr. HAYDEN presented a manuscript prepared by the Legislative Service of the Library of Congress relating to the selection and establishment of Federal field offices, which, on request of Mr. HAYDEN, was ordered to be printed.

TRAINING OF ENLISTED RESERVISTS UNDER CIVIL AERONAUTICS AUTHORITY

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. President, a number of Senators have made inquiry of me as to the status of certain enlisted reservists who are undergoing training under the supervision of the C. A. A. War Training Service. In response to their letters I asked for the information from the Civil Aeronautics Division of the Department of Commerce. I have a letter stating the facts, and I think the contents of the letter are sufficiently interesting to justify printing the letter in the RECORD. I believe that Members of Congress would be glad to have the information. Therefore I ask leave to have the letter printed in the RECORD as a part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE,
CIVIL AERONAUTICS ADMINISTRATION,
Washington, March 12, 1943.

HON. JOSIAH W. BAILEY,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR BAILEY: Owing to the absence from Washington of Mr. William A. M. Burden, I am writing to give you the information requested in your letter of March 9, concerning the status of certain enlisted reservists who are being trained under the supervision of the Civil Aeronautics Administration War Training Service.

The accompanying memorandum outlines the arrangements under which these men are receiving training. As stated therein, they do not receive any pay, allowances, or other compensation. They must make their own arrangements to provide the funds needed to supply pocket money and to pay for personal necessities other than those which are provided in the way of board, lodging, nonmilitary uniforms, and equipment, by the Civil Aeronautics Administration War Training Service. In this connection, however, it should be mentioned that men who are carried through to graduation from the pilot instructor course will have received approximately \$5,000 worth of free tuition from the Government and will have acquired skills which should enable them to earn satisfactory incomes. This is important when it is remembered that the men are being trained as noncombat service pilots with a view to employment by the Army in a civilian capacity as instructors in the Army's civil contract schools or as transport copilots.

As you know, the training program conducted by the Civil Aeronautics Administration War Training Service (formerly known as Civilian Pilot Training) has gone through two major phases. The third phase has commenced and will soon be fully in operation.

The first phase covered the period from the enactment of the Civilian Pilot Training Act in 1939 until June 30, 1942. In that phase, the program was essentially a program for the training of civilians. It was largely an extracurricular activity carried on in conjunction with the regular education of young men in the colleges or in other institutions of higher learning. It could be and was a decentralized program. The persons who received training as pilots were civilians in every sense of the word and were wholly free to employ the techniques and skills which they had acquired in whatever way best suited their individual inclinations and opportunities.

The program which was conducted during the first phase equipped many thousands of

men to take their places promptly and effectively in war aviation. The rapid expansion of our Navy and Army Air Forces was aided materially by the existence of this trained group.

Following our entry into the war, it became apparent that it would be necessary greatly to accelerate the training program and to place it on a more definitely controlled and centralized basis. Planning to this end went on in the early months of 1942. Effective July 1, 1942, the training program was launched on its second phase.

During this second phase, after July 1, 1942, all of the training facilities available through the Civil Aeronautics Administration were employed exclusively for the training of men having Reserve status in the Army or Navy.

The field organization of the Civil Aeronautics Administration War Training Service undertook the responsibility of acting, in a sense, as a recruiting agency to provide non-combat service pilots for the Army. All of the men undergoing training by Civil Aeronautics Administration for the Army Air Forces were examined and selected by the Civil Aeronautics Administration organization or by contractors working under the supervision of the Civil Aeronautics Administration. Following selection, these men were presented to the Army recruiting centers for voluntary enlistment. While undergoing training, they were enlisted members of the Reserve on inactive status. But they were being trained as civilians, and, as I have said, it was intended that many of them, on completion of their training, should be employed in a civilian status, some as pilots with the air-transport service, others as instructors in the Army's civil contract primary schools or as instructors with the Civil Aeronautics Administration War Training Service. Their enlistment in the Reserve was intended to accomplish two purposes. It involved a definite commitment on the part of the trainee to devote himself to service in the war program, as a civilian or otherwise, on the completion of his training. At the same time, his Reserve status gave him assurance that he would not be called into service as a soldier through the operation of the National Selective Service Act until his training as a pilot had been completed or until he had been eliminated from further training because of failure to meet the required tests and examinations.

Many of the men who were enlisted in the Army Air Corps Enlisted Reserve during the second phase of the program are still in training, and we expect that their training will be completed in accordance with the arrangements which were contemplated at the time of their acceptance for training as Air Corps enlisted reservists on inactive status as outlined in the accompanying paper.

It is estimated that approximately 12,500 of these men are now undergoing training or are awaiting assignment to training. Enlistment in the Reserve for the purpose of this training was stopped by the manpower directive of December 5, 1942, which prohibited voluntary enlistment in the Army or Navy, including their reserve components.

Prior to December 15, 1942, the Civil Aeronautics Administration War Training Service was also engaged in providing elementary and certain other classes of flight instruction for a group of naval enlisted reservists on inactive status. These men were not paid. They were trained under the same general conditions as those which applied to the Army Air Corps enlisted reservists on inactive status. There was, however, one important difference in their status. The naval reservists were aviation cadet candidates physically qualified as combat pilots and were undergoing training preliminary to active training by the

Navy for combat duty. Largely because of this fact, the Navy took action effective December 15, 1942, to call all of these men to active duty, and since that date they have been in receipt of the regular authorized pay for the Navy while undergoing training under the supervision of the Civil Aeronautics Administration War Training Center.

In conjunction with the college program which has been arranged by the Army, a large number of Army Air Corps aviation cadet candidates are being placed in the colleges for academic instruction. While undergoing such instruction, they are to have the status of enlisted men on active duty and will be paid accordingly by the Army. Each month approximately one-fifth of the number of these aviation cadets are to be given elementary flight instruction through the Civil Aeronautics Administration War Training Service. Prior to being called to active duty for the purpose of undergoing academic instruction in the colleges, these men were, for the most part, Army Air Corps enlisted reservists on inactive status. They are, of course, destined for training and employment as Army combat pilots.

The remaining group—that is, the Army Air Corps enlisted reservists on inactive status about whom you have inquired—will then be the only group of men who have been enlisted in the Reserve to be trained as pilots (in this case, as noncombat pilots) for whom no provision has been made in the way of compensation payments.

A good many complaints have been registered from various sections of the country as to the status of these men. Rightly or wrongly, the view appears to be held that they should be given the same treatment as has been accorded to the aviation cadet (combat pilots) candidates of the Army and Navy.

It is not desirable, in our judgment, that the noncombat group of trainees be called to active duty as soldiers since such action would make it impossible to employ them in a civilian status in the war effort on completion of their training. Accordingly, if it is the view of the Congress that they should receive compensation at the rates which they would receive as enlisted men on active duty, it would seem desirable that arrangements be made to provide for the payment of such compensation without having them called to active duty with the Army.

This would apparently require specific legislative authorization together with a supplementary appropriation to provide funds required to make compensation payments. The Bureau of the Budget has not approved submission to the Congress of any proposals or requests relating to this matter.

The correspondence which accompanied your letter is returned herewith.

Sincerely yours,

R. McLEAN STEWART,
Executive Director of Training.

OPERATIONS OF LOCAL DRAFT BOARDS— STATEMENT BY JOHN J. GRIFFIN

[Mr. CLARK of Missouri asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article relative to the operation of local draft boards, embodying a statement by Col. John J. Griffin, which appears in the Appendix.]

NATIONAL RESOURCES PLANNING BOARD—ARTICLE BY JOSEPH P. McMURRAY

[Mr. PEPPER asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article entitled "Despite Great Achievements the National Resources Planning Board Faces Extinction," written by Joseph P. McMurray, and published in the March 13, 1943, edition of America, which appears in the Appendix.]

DEFERMENT FROM MILITARY SERVICE OF PERSONS ENGAGED IN AGRICULTURE

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 729) providing for the deferment from military service of persons engaged in agricultural occupations.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the amendment proposed by the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. KILGORE] on behalf of the Senator from Florida [Mr. PEPPER] as a substitute for the amendment of the Senator from Colorado [Mr. JOHNSON].

Mr. PEPPER obtained the floor.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. PEPPER. I yield.

Mr. HILL. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Alken	Gillette	Overton
Austin	Gurney	Pepper
Bailey	Hatch	Radcliffe
Ball	Hawkes	Reed
Bankhead	Hayden	Revercomb
Bilbo	Hill	Reynolds
Bone	Holman	Robertson
Brewster	Johnson, Calif.	Scruggs
Bridges	Johnson, Colo.	Shipstead
Brooks	Kilgore	Smith
Buck	La Follette	Taft
Burton	Langer	Thomas, Idaho
Bushfield	Lodge	Thomas, Okla.
Byrd	Lucas	Thomas, Utah
Capper	McCarran	Tobey
Caraway	McClellan	Tunnell
Chavez	McFarland	Tydings
Clark, Idaho	McNary	Vandenberg
Clark, Mo.	Maloney	Van Nuys
Connally	Maybank	Wagner
Danaher	Millikin	Walsh
Davis	Moore	Wherry
Downey	Murdock	White
Ellender	Nye	Wiley
Ferguson	O'Daniel	Willis
George	O'Mahoney	Wilson

Mr. McNARY. The Senator from Nebraska [Mr. BUTLER] and the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. BARBOUR] are necessarily absent.

Mr. HILL. I announce that the Senator from Florida [Mr. ANDREWS], the Senator from Virginia [Mr. GLASS], the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. McKEL-LAR], and the Senator from Indiana [Mr. VAN NUYS] are absent from the Senate because of illness.

The Senator from Kentucky [Mr. CHANDLER], the Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY], the Senator from Missouri [Mr. TRUMAN], and the Senator from Washington [Mr. WALLGREN] are absent on official business for the Senate.

The Senator from Kentucky [Mr. BARKLEY], the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. EASTLAND], the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. GREEN], the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. GUFFEY], the Senator from New York [Mr. MEAD], and the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. STEWART] are detained on important public business.

The Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL] is necessarily absent.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Seventy-eight Senators having answered to their names, a quorum is present.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, I wish to address myself for a few moments to

the pending amendment, with respect to which I ask unanimous consent that the name of the able Senator from West Virginia [Mr. KILGORE] be added as cosponsor, if there is no objection.

Mr. McNARY. Mr. President, I thought that the name of the Senator from West Virginia appeared at the time of the offering of the amendment.

Mr. PEPPER. I had understood, although I may be in error, that the able Senator from West Virginia had asked that the amendment be offered in the name of the junior Senator from Florida, but perhaps I am mistaken.

Mr. McNARY. I think I should have to object to a request of this kind. Any document when offered must of course bear the name of one or the names of more than one sponsor, and in that form it is referred to a committee. Later, after the document has been referred to a committee and is on the floor of the Senate, I do not think it would be appropriate to ask that the name of another Senator be included as a sponsor. I am willing to concede that the Senator from West Virginia is in favor of the proposal of the Senator from Florida, in fact, he spoke in support of it yesterday; but I should prefer that the RECORD be not changed to include any other name than that appearing at the time the document was presented.

Mr. PEPPER. I withdraw the request.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The request of the Senator from Florida is withdrawn.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, I had an opportunity yesterday to witness something which made a very deep impression upon me. By arrangements made some days ago I was present when representatives of the Office of Price Administration heard the vegetable growers of Florida with respect to fixing a ceiling price upon vegetables, and I saw gathered in a great market, while the trucks were moving vegetables from the fields to this market for sale and transportation to the consumption centers of the country, some six or eight hundred vegetable growers.

Those men were not theorists; those men were not jobbers, brokers, or tradesmen in vegetables. Those men were the actual dirt producers of vegetables. They were not only of the farm; they were farmers themselves. All through the day I heard those men from the farms tell of the problems they had in trying to get their hard-earned money back out of the soil, and principally the difficulty they had in getting enough labor to do it. I was told again and again that literally thousands of acres of fresh vegetables so vitally needed by the people of this country, men, women, and children, so vitally needed by the war workers and the soldiers and our allies, were going to rot in the fields because those growers could not get the labor with which to harvest those products.

Anyone who hears that story first hand from men who have invested thousands of dollars of their money in such crops, who sees the deep earnestness on their faces, and hears the note of sincerity in their voices, cannot fail to be impressed

by the seriousness of the labor problem which faces agriculture in our country.

I stated to that group of growers that I expected today to oppose the amendment of my able and devoted friend the distinguished senior Senator from Alabama [Mr. BANKHEAD], and I stated why I proposed to oppose the able Senator's amendment. First, because I thought it did not solve the problem of putting labor upon the farms; that it was the case, as a Senator has already said on the floor of the Senate, of locking the barn door after the horse is stolen. The labor has already been taken from the farms by the draft, and by induction into industry and better-paid occupations. I believe the figures were given by my able friend the Senator from Alabama, the sponsor of this amendment, that probably where three men eligible for the draft had gone into the service seven had gone into industry, if I do not incorrectly remember the figures he gave.

Why that is true is obvious when we reflect upon the figures which the able Senator from Maryland [Mr. TYDINGS] recently gave upon the floor of the Senate, and I regret to say that my section of the country is one of the greatest offenders in the matter of the payment of low wages to those engaged in agriculture. A principal difficulty, therefore, comes about from the disparity between the wage the farm worker receives when he works upon the farm and what he would receive if he obtained a place in industry.

The average monthly wage in agriculture in 1942, without board, was \$56.07. This figure is taken from the table inserted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of Wednesday, March 19, by the Senator from Maryland [Mr. TYDINGS], appearing on page 1779.

By contrast, the average hourly entrance rates for common labor in manufacturing industries, as calculated by the Bureau of Labor Statistics, permit a man working straight time with no overtime to earn almost \$94 per month. In 1942 the average entrance rate for common labor in industry was 58.5 cents per hour. Working a normal 40-hour week, a worker could earn approximately \$93.60. This is a 67-percent higher wage than he could earn in agriculture. Average entrance rates and earnings for common labor in building construction and in the war industries are considerably higher. In aircraft-engine factories an ordinary unskilled worker could earn on straight time over \$130 per month. In shipyards he could earn up to \$150 per month, although in some shipyards earnings are considerably lower than this figure.

With the establishment of the 48-hour week the worker entering industry has the opportunity to earn 30 percent more than the monthly rates cited above. The farm worker who moves into war industry is thus able to earn from two to almost four times as much as the average wage paid to farm labor in 1942. Because we did not have a comprehensive manpower policy in this country, because we allowed the Army and the Navy and the other services to take labor from the farms, because we allowed industry, for perfectly

legitimate reasons, to drain the farms of their men, we have the manpower shortage which now faces us. So, passing this bill simply to defer the men still on the farms is not going to put that labor back upon the farms which has already gone into the services and into industry.

Mr. President, in the second place I oppose the amendment of the able Senator from Alabama, as modified, because it disestablishes the principle of personal accountability to serve one's country in the draft. It gives a blanket deferment not to a few people, as for example, the 531 who are Members of Congress—and the able Senator from Iowa awhile ago referred to the fact that there has already been class deferments because Congress had been deferred. The total number deferred in the Congress is only 531. That would not make a very large army. In addition to that the age of Members of Congress is well known to the country; so that that blanket deferment of the Congress actually kept very few men out of the armed services of the Nation. In the Senate itself I believe I am the third youngest Senator, and I am 42 years old; I doubt, therefore, if more than 2 or 3 Senators at the outside would have been drafted had that blanket deferment not been provided in the draft law.

Mr. President, the principle of democracy in selective service is that every man's case is passed upon according to its merits, with the exception of the few exemptions provided in the bill totaling not many hundreds.

If we have a blanket deferment, therefore, we will have this sort of situation: There will be a prosperous farmer living upon a large farm; he will have a son who is about to reach the age of 18. When that boy reaches 18 years, if he performs any kind of farm work, then under the provisions of the amendment offered by the able Senator from Alabama, if it shall be adopted, that boy by the authority of Congress is kept out of the service of his country. But if a quarter of a mile down the road there is a little country merchant who has a son who becomes 18 years of age, or if there is a widow who runs a boarding house nearby whose son comes to the age of 18, that boy has to go to the service, unless the individual case is deferred by the draft board.

Mr. President, if a boy is essential to the maintenance of an agricultural operation which itself is essential, then the boy ought to be deferred, but that case ought to be passed on individually, and not be the subject of blanket legislation enacted by the National Congress hundreds or thousands of miles away from the scene and the persons involved.

We already know that a large number of these boys have gone from the farms. I stood yesterday in front of a service center in Fort Lauderdale, and I saw literally hundreds and hundreds of names which were there emblazoned on that roll of honor to indicate the number of boys from that one community who have already gone to the service. As a matter of fact it is astonishing to find how many have been taken out of every community. So most of these farm boys

who have reached the eligible age for the draft have already gone into the service. They did not have the benefit of draft legislation of blanket character enacted by the Congress. They were passed upon in respect to their individual cases.

We know that there have already been many deferments of agricultural labor by the draft boards. But where those deferments have occurred the individual case of the individual boy has justified such deferment. I am not willing to take the responsibility as a Senator to lay down a blanket rule that will draw a line of demarcation and set aside a special class of our citizens who under any and all circumstances are entitled to exemption and immunity from a duty to serve their country when no other class in the Nation is similarly situated. If there were provision in this amendment so that the matter of deferment were an individual matter relative to the need of the family of the boy called or the situation of the young man himself, that would be an entirely different matter, and this particular objection which I feel toward it would not exist in my mind.

So I say that two reasons—and I believe they are worthy of consideration—namely, first, that passage of this bill will not put back upon the farm the labor which was once there and which has already gone into the service and into industry, and, second, because it is not fair to give a blanket deferment to any class of men—will lead me to opposition, as I told this group of 800 dirt farmers yesterday, to this bill.

Mr. President, the other objection I have to it is that it is not a comprehensive approach to this difficult problem of making the best use of the Nation's manpower. I do not propose any panacea for the difficult problem; in fact, it comes the nearest to being an enigma of almost any problem of which I know. For example, you run into this dilemma: The farmers admittedly are opposed to subsidy, even for labor, although the amendment offered by the able Senator from West Virginia [Mr. KILGORE] and myself contains the authority in the Director of Manpower to employ labor for the purpose of supplying labor deficiencies wherever they may exist. It gives him the power to fix the compensation of such labor, with due regard to the value of the individual worker and the competitive-labor-market condition with which the Manpower Director has to compete.

I realize that we run afoul of an emotional attitude on the part of farmers when we start talking about a subsidy, even for labor. In my State the impasse is so difficult that the only solution of the problem, to prevent thousands of acres of vegetables from rotting in the fields, seems to be to bring in labor from Nassau and Jamaica. The producers are almost 100 percent in favor of such action. I have been reluctant to embrace that principle. I am an American citizen. I do not want to see foreign labor brought into this country to compete with our own labor, except as a last resort. I have been subjected to rather severe

criticism by the growers because I have been reluctant to agree to the importation of foreign labor. Some say that labor from Puerto Rico where the situation is so acute and poverty so severe, should be brought into this country. Those of our people who profess some knowledge of the situation in Puerto Rico have said that Puerto Ricans do not speak our language sufficiently well to be effective farm workers. They study English in the schools but it is something like our students studying a foreign language. It is all right theoretically, but one cannot get along very well when he is called upon to speak the language. The growers in Florida have used Nassau labor before. They used it during the First World War. That labor speaks the English language. It is accustomed to the cultivation and harvesting of such important crops as tomatoes, which we grow. There is great skill involved in knowing what tomatoes to pick and what not to pick. It is said that this type of labor has that skill. The growers say they are willing to pay a fair wage for this labor.

Mr. President, my embarrassment can be understood. When I say that we prefer to use our domestic labor the growers say that the program which the Government has followed has been a pitiful failure. The Farm Security Administration has had it under its jurisdiction. It tried to bring workers to Florida from other States. Unhappily, some of them had objectionable diseases before they got there. Some of the growers told me that repeatedly they had to send men to doctors for treatment. Unhappily, the men had not been examined before being taken from their home States. Some of them took advantage of the opportunity of having their expenses paid to Florida, remained there for a few days, and then went back, like tourists. Some were itinerant preachers, others itinerant gamblers, and there may have been characters of lesser virtue in the group which has flowed in. Naturally, the growers have been dissatisfied with that kind of labor.

Mr. President, if I am not able to show them that our own Government has worked out an effective labor policy which will assure them a supply of labor when the Government is calling upon them to produce and meet production schedules established by the Secretary of Agriculture, who is the Food Administrator, how can I defend against a plausible proposal like the importation of foreign labor?

It seems to me that the great difficulty with our whole war program is that too often we have approached it piece-meal, just as my able friend proposes to deal with the problem of furnishing labor to agriculture in his amendment.

I venture, therefore, to attempt to delay the consideration of the pending bill for only a few minutes. Of course we are to vote on it today. I am proposing a concrete and affirmative program on the subject, and I am grateful to the Senate for being good enough to consider it.

This is essentially what my substitute amendment provides. I read from section 2:

There is hereby created a Committee on Requirements and Program (referred to in this act as the "Committee") under the chairmanship of a Director of War Mobilization to be appointed by the President (referred to in this act as the "Director") and consisting of the Secretaries of War and Navy, the Chief of Staff of the Army, the Chief of Naval Operations, the Chairman of the War Manpower Commission, the Chairman of the War Production Board, the Food Administrator, and the Director of Economic Stabilization. This committee shall establish, subject to review and modification by the President, a national program for maximum mobilization of manpower for the military forces and for military and essential civilian production (referred to in this act as the "program"). The program shall take the form of a detailed schedule of military and essential civilian production and specific quotas of manpower to be made available to the military forces and to particular categories of military and civilian production. In preparing the program the committee shall take into account schedules of military and essential civilian production furnished by the Chairman of the War Production Board and the Food Administrator according to appropriate jurisdiction, statements of manpower requirements for the military forces furnished by the War and Navy Departments, and statements of manpower requirements for military and essential civilian production furnished by the Chairman of the War Manpower Commission and determined by him in cooperation with the Chairman of the War Production Board and the Food Administrator. The quotas of manpower to be made available to the military forces as determined under the program shall supersede present quotas employed under the Selective Training and Service Act of 1940. The schedules of military and essential civilian production and the manpower quotas relating thereto determined under the program shall be binding upon the War Production Board, the Food Administration, the War Manpower Commission, the Office of Economic Stabilization, and other war agencies on their determination and operations relating to production and manpower.

In conjunction with that section I now read section 7:

There is hereby created a Board of War Mobilization under the chairmanship of the Director and consisting of four representatives of agriculture, four representatives of industry, four representatives of labor, and four public members at large appointed by the President. The Board shall hold regular meetings at least once a month. The Board shall make to the Director and the Chairman of the War Manpower Commission, the Chairman of the War Production Board, the Director of Economic Stabilization, and the Food Administrator all of whom shall advise and consult with the Board on all major policies of manpower mobilization, such recommendations relating to policy and operation as it may deem will improve production and manpower mobilization.

Let me briefly discuss those two sections.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. PEPPER. I yield.

Mr. VANDENBERG. It seems obvious to me that what the Senator has read lays down an appropriate over-all rule as the basis for fixing quotas.

Mr. PEPPER. That is what it is intended to do.

Mr. VANDENBERG. I should like to ask the Senator from Florida if there is any necessity for a law to achieve that purpose, or has there been any necessity for it in the past 12 months? Could not the President have done precisely that which is provided for in the amendment if he had taken over-all command of the manpower problem?

Mr. PEPPER. No doubt the President had the power to put such a program into effect. Yet, in recent months, at least, the Congress has been addressing itself to these problems directly. We all know that decisions have been made. We all understand from the press that the President has appointed a group of distinguished men who are considering the question of manpower. I do not know what authority the President has delegated to them. I do not know whether they have authority to re-examine the size of the Army and Navy as proposed, or the size of other services as proposed. I do not know what mandate they have been given by Executive order. However, I think the Congress might, with perfect propriety, create a statutory body upon whom the responsibility of making the over-all allocation of manpower would rest pursuant to the authority of the people's Congress.

Here in the Senate we have heard able Senators speak of the size of the armed services. I do not know whether or not the proposed army is too large. I do not know whether such forces are essential to the prosecution of the war. I do not know whether, when the quotas were fixed, the needs of manpower on the farms and in industry were taken into consideration adequately. However, I do know that if Congress should designate the agencies to which I have referred in this amendment as the over-all authority to decide that question, with the congressional admonition that they take into account civilian needs, surely the matter would be put squarely into the hands of those who ought to know how to decide the problem.

The armed services are represented. The head of the War Production Board is represented. The Food Administrator is represented. The Director of Economic Stabilization is a member and the Chairman of the War Manpower Commission would be a member of the board. So we have a committee of service and civilian representatives which could, by the admonition of the Congress, reconsider the matter and see whether or not any determinations previously made are correct in the light of the knowledge which now exists, and the needs which face the country today.

I cannot see why anybody should object to the personnel of the proposed board, unless it is desired to add others: The Secretary of War, the Secretary of the Navy, the Chief of Staff of the Army, the Chief of Naval Operations of the Navy, and the representatives of the other civilian agencies to which I have referred would be members of the board. For the first time the Congress itself would say that the Nation's manpower, like the Nation's critical materials, must be fairly allocated among the Nation's

needs. Today that declaration is not upon the statute books of this country as a congressional policy.

If the proposed committee should fail to carry out the mandate of Congress, it would be a failure of duty on the part of the executive department, and not a failure on the part of Congress, to make proper provision for a decision being made. I venture to say that it would be much fairer for this kind of a board to make the over-all decision than for the Senate or the House or any of our committees to make it. At best we are limited in our experience, background, and horizon of knowledge. However, collectively these men are prosecuting the war, and they are responsible for maintaining production in industry, upon the farms, and in other essential activities of the Nation. It seems to me that those who think the Army is too large, and those who think that the administration has not accurately weighed the necessities of agriculture, for example, would favor such an over-all board as the one which I propose.

That is not being achieved by the amendment of my able friend the Senator from Alabama. He is not setting up any over-all board. There is none proposed, so far as I know, except by the Austin-Wadsworth bill, virtuous as it is in some respects; but to it I am opposed at the present time because it embodies the principle of coercion, and I want to avoid until the last resort the necessity of coercion of our civilian population. For obviously to send a man to the service of his country in his Nation's uniform and at a statutory compensation is one thing, but to send a worker to the field or factory of a man who makes a profit upon that operation and his labor without many, many safeguards surrounding that assignment is contrary to what is the very basic principle of democracy—civil rights. What I am trying to avoid is the necessity that we shall wake up to some day—of meeting chaos and confusion in some stern way, and then the proponents of coercion will hold out that the alternative is the coercion which they propose.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. PEPPER. I yield.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I have followed with a great deal of interest and much sympathy what the Senator has been saying, but is it not obvious from what he has just now said that the amendment he proposes to the pending bill is, like the pending bill itself, part of the whole large problem which is now under consideration in the Committee on Military Affairs which is studying the so-called Austin-Wadsworth bill?

Mr. PEPPER. I am glad to answer my able friend and the distinguished senior Senator from Wyoming by saying "yes"; and let me say that I have already advised the able sponsor of the amendment to which mine is addressed as a substitute that my first motion will be that the pending amendment be a substitute for the amendment, as modified, of the able Senator from Alabama, and my second motion, if the first is not agreed

to, will be to refer the Bankhead amendment back to the Committee on Military Affairs for further consideration of the whole subject which is now being regarded by it.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, I am very glad to have the Senator make that statement because I believe that is the only sensible procedure to take; because we cannot possibly deal with one aspect after another. That is the trouble at this hour. For over a year we have seen the problem of war manpower creep up on us, but we have not taken an over-all course to solve the whole problem.

Mr. PEPPER. I thank the able Senator. He simply echoes my own sentiments.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. President, will the Senator yield on that point.

Mr. PEPPER. I yield.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. I am sure that the Senator from Wyoming recalls that one of the sponsors of the so-called Austin-Wadsworth bill stated to our committee that it would be absolutely impossible to enact it into legislation and have it effective before January 1, 1944. Of course the Bankhead bill is dealing with the present crop. If the Austin-Wadsworth bill is finally enacted on January 1, 1944, it will supersede all legislation that is enacted at any previous time. The Senate Military Affairs Committee, having that knowledge and basing their action upon the fact that the Austin-Wadsworth bill would not be effective for a long, long time, brought out the Bankhead bill.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, I thank the able Senator for that statement. In trying to meet that contingency, I have first offered this alternative. Therefore, Mr. President, I should like to show what affirmative good might come from the pending substitute if the Senate in its wisdom were to adopt it. I have referred to the first paragraph of it, namely, to establish an over-all principle of having a proper determination, by a competent committee whose status is established by the Congress itself, of the way the manpower resources of the Nation should be allocated. That is the first step.

Here is the second step—the one which will accomplish everything the amendment of the able Senator from Alabama will accomplish, and will do no injustice to any man or to any class of our citizenry already in service. I am referring to section 3, on page 3:

Sec. 3. The Selective Training and Service Act of 1940, as amended, is further amended by adding at the end thereof the following:

"Any provision of this act to the contrary notwithstanding—

"(1) whenever the Chairman of the War Manpower Commission deems it necessary in order to meet the program determined in accordance with section 2 of the Manpower Mobilization Act—

That means the program determined upon by the Secretary of War, the Secretary of the Navy, the Chief of Staff, the Chief of Naval Operations—those are the heads of the military services—the Chair-

man of the War Production Board, the Chairman of the Manpower Commission, and the Food Administrator—

That occupational deferments be granted to persons engaged in military or essential civilian production or in essential activity related thereto, he shall make a finding—

And, Mr. President, at that point I ask unanimous consent to perfect my amendment by adding the words "subject to review by the President."

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MURDOCK in the chair). The Senator has the right, of course, to perfect or modify his own amendment; and it will be modified accordingly.

Mr. PEPPER. I continue to read:

To this effect and such findings shall be conclusive upon all civilian local boards and any other civilian agencies functioning under this act. No other occupational deferments shall be granted under this act except upon such a finding by the Chairman of the War Manpower Commission.

(2) For purposes of making an individual finding as to occupational deferment, the Chairman of the War Manpower Commission is empowered, subject to direction by the President, to employ the officers or employees of the War Manpower Commission or of any other Federal agency and to establish such additional organization and procedure as he shall deem necessary and proper.

Mr. President, that section—those two subdivisions—would accomplish every worthy thing which the amendment of the able senior Senator from Alabama would accomplish, namely, the occupational deferment of every man adjudicated to be necessary in agriculture, or in industry for that matter; and the War Manpower Authority would have the power, and by the principle of this bill would have the duty, to file an appropriate certificate requiring such deferment. He has the power to delegate his authority, for example, to a county agricultural agent or, for example, to the local representative of the Food Administrator in a given county, and to set up as his advisory committee a group of farmers, for example, well acquainted with the agricultural needs of a given area; and if that group, that authority, determines that a boy eligible for service in the services were needed upon the farm, they would have the power to require the boy's deferment by simply filing a certificate to that effect. But if they found out that the boy, although living on the farm, was not personally entitled to deferment, they would not, we presume, file such a certificate.

So, therefore, everything in the way of deferment of agricultural workers which should be done and could be done under the amendment of the able senior Senator from Alabama therefore becomes possible under the substitute which the able senior Senator from West Virginia [Mr. KILGORE] and I have ventured to offer.

Therefore we do not have to wait until January 1944, I say to the able Senator from Colorado. We can accomplish exactly what the able senior Senator from Alabama desires to have accomplished, that is to say, not leave the question of agricultural deferment up to the draft boards, but put it in the hands of the

Food Administrator and his subordinates, and in that way not one needed worker will be taken from the farm, nor will there be left there a boy who in duty and conscience should go to his country's service.

A farm boy seeks no preference over his neighbors, and I am not willing to give him one unless his individual situation deserves and requires it; and I do not see why the Congress should want to require him to become the object of criticism and question by his neighbors and his comrades who some day will come back to be neighbors with him again, unless the community is satisfied that the situation in that boy's individual family and home is such as to make it fair to the Nation and to him and to his comrades that he stay behind and till the soil, instead of putting on his country's uniform and going forth to perform the defense of his country.

So why should the Congress wish to prefer a blanket deferment to some sensible principle like that, which is the very essence of the whole Selective Service System?

Mr. VANDENBERG. Mr. President, will the Senator yield so that I may ask him a question?

Mr. PEPPER. I yield to the able senior Senator from Michigan.

Mr. VANDENBERG. It seems to me that the Senator is just 1,000 percent sound up to the present point. I happen to be one of those who are very reluctant to launch upon occupational deferments and group deferments. I am also one of those who recognize the fact that under the present administration of the draft law there has been precipitated a farm problem which must be met in respect to labor and which can no longer be left to the mercy of what we may call inadequate administration. It seems to me that up to this point the Senator offers a completely adequate substitute which would achieve the farm result without invading the dubious field of occupational deferment.

Mr. PEPPER. I thank the Senator.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Now I ask the Senator why he does not, at least for the time being, stop at that point, instead of bringing in, no matter how worthy it may inherently be, a controversial postscript which might well be deferred.

Mr. PEPPER. Does the Senator refer to section 5, the one relative to recruiting workers?

Mr. VANDENBERG. I refer to the purpose of creating the National Emergency Workers Corps.

Mr. PEPPER. That is what I thought. I have given very serious consideration to what the able Senator has said, and I was already practically disposed toward the suggestion which he makes. I do realize that up to this point I cannot see why anybody would object to having an over-all determination of those needs by competent authorities, and having an individual deferment of the men by a competent agency.

I now ask unanimous consent, Mr. President, to delete from the substitute which has been offered and which is now the pending amendment section 5 thereof.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator has the right to delete any portion of his proposed substitute.

Mr. PEPPER. I also ask unanimous consent to delete section 6 which is necessarily a part of section 5.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment of the Senator from Florida will be modified as requested by him.

Mr. BANKHEAD. Mr. President, may I ask the Senator a question?

Mr. PEPPER. I gladly yield.

Mr. BANKHEAD. Is it not a fact that the members of the commission or board which has been designated, or a majority of them at least, have already passed upon the allocations of manpower?

Mr. PEPPER. I will say to the able Senator that, in the way they would pass upon it under the terms of this proposal, no. In the first place they have never been an agency of the Congress; in the second place, so far as I know they have never sat down around a table by admonition of Congress to resurvey this whole question in the light of the facts as they now exist. The Senator will understand that in this amendment there is given to them the power to review the decisions which have already been arrived at by the armed services as to the number of men required for military service.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. PEPPER. I yield.

Mr. VANDENBERG. As I understand the situation, there never heretofore has been any requirement of a united recommendation covering the over-all manpower problem.

Mr. PEPPER. That is true.

Mr. VANDENBERG. The President could have required it, but he did not do so.

Mr. PEPPER. That statement is confirmed, I will say to the able Senator from Michigan, by the fact that the President now has another able group consisting of some of the most distinguished men in the Government and in the Nation, but, at the same time, the group which is making the decision, as the able Senator will recall, is made up, I believe, of former Justice Byrnes, Mr. Bernard M. Baruch, possibly, Admiral Leahy, and I believe by Judge Rosenman.

Mr. VANDENBERG. And I beg the Senator not to ignore Mr. Harry Hopkins.

Mr. PEPPER. And Mr. Harry Hopkins. The gentlemen named constitute the group of five who are considering this whole subject anew. The President has chosen to have a review of this subject by a competent agency. Why cannot Congress have a review of the subject by a competent agency, every one of whom has been appointed by the President himself? Therefore, how could there be any possible objection to the Congress saying, "We should like a reconsideration of this whole question by the Secretary of War, the Secretary of the Navy, the Chief of Staff of the Army, the Chief of Naval Operations, the head of the War Production Board, the Food Administrator, the War Manpower Commission Chairman, and the Director of Economic Stabilization? I do not know

of any more competent agency that could be selected than that.

Mr. VANDENBERG. And with the directive that quotas must be reorganized on the basis of the joint determination by all the responsible administrators of the Government.

Mr. PEPPER. Exactly. Then the amendment would admonish them to do that with knowledge of the situation as it now exists, regardless of what they previously may have adjudicated. They would pass upon the matter in the light of the knowledge of facts as they now exist.

Therefore, Mr. President, it would seem to me that the able Senator from Alabama and those who are in favor of the occupational deferment of farm labor could find in such a provision everything they hope to achieve, and at the same time not offend the whole core and heart of the selective-service principle of every man having his own case passed upon in accordance with the justice of the particular case.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Mr. President, I will not interrupt the Senator from Florida again.

Mr. PEPPER. I welcome the Senator's interruptions.

Mr. VANDENBERG. But if he will allow me, I should like to say that he has now put his substitute in a form which I am very happy to support.

Mr. PEPPER. I am very grateful to the Senator from Michigan.

Mr. DANAHER. Mr. President—

Mr. PEPPER. I yield.

Mr. DANAHER. I should like to invite the Senator's attention to section 4, page 4, where the Senator under the terms of his proposal would authorize the Chairman of the War Manpower Commission to provide equipment, transportation, and so forth—

Now I quote—

to workers being placed in or transferred to war or essential civilian activity.

Mr. PEPPER. If the Senator will permit me to interrupt him there, that was all consistent with sections 5 and 6, which I have already deleted from the amendment. I thank the Senator for the reminder that that also should be deleted. So I ask unanimous consent, Mr. President, to delete section 4 as well from the amendment.

Mr. DANAHER. I thank the Senator. The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be further modified, as requested by the Senator from Florida.

Mr. PEPPER. Now, I wish to call the attention of the Senators to two additional things that appear under section 3. First, Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent further to modify the amendment. I should like the attention of the able Senator from Michigan [Mr. VANDENBERG]. I wanted him to know that I had intended to modify the amendment in the following respects, which I wanted the able Senator to observe:

At the appropriate place as the amendment has been modified I would insert:

The Chairman of the War Manpower Commission is authorized and directed to survey the need for and the efficiency of use of labor

employed or engaged in production or service, and for these purposes shall have all necessary access to production facilities and information.

That is intended to provide labor inspectors in factories to ascertain whether or not an employer is actually making efficient use of the labor he has employed. We have heard again and again the criticism that shipyards and airplane factories and other war industries have hired more labor than they need, and we thought it was only proper that some representative of the Government manpower agency should have the right of access to such factories, to see whether they are, as a matter of fact, employing and absorbing more labor than they ought to, and whether the employees are working or whether they are idling their time in the factories.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. PEPPER. I yield.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. This morning, when the Senate met, I put into the Record some criticism of the present selective service system by Colonel Griffin, the head of the association of draft boards in the St. Louis metropolitan area. One thing that Colonel Griffin has told me he believes is to some extent responsible for the manpower shortage is the fact that, under the present selective service system, the local board at the home of a man who is registered in the selective service always retains jurisdiction over his case. Colonel Griffin tells me that there are literally thousands upon thousands of men who come into the St. Louis metropolitan area from rural Missouri or rural Illinois or from Arkansas, Mississippi, Alabama, or some other State to obtain jobs, some of which are actually in connection with munition plants, for instance, in the Curtiss-Wright factory or other concerns engaged in war work, but whose actual service to the plant is not essential.

Yet they write back to the local draft board at Lone Ridge, Ark., or some place in Missouri or some place in Illinois and tell the local board that they are working for an essential war industry, such as the Curtiss-Wright plant, and they are thereupon deferred; whereas if the local board in St. Louis had the right to go through those plants they would find men engaged as timekeepers or water carriers, or in other absolutely nonessential work which could be performed just as well by older men or women or disabled men, and the man who was actually performing the work would be eligible for service. Colonel Griffin tells me—and I believe it to be true—that thousands of men who are doing nonessential work, even though it may be in essential war industries, and who are perfectly capable of rendering good military service could be relieved for such service. I have been informed today by Colonel Keesling of the Selective Service that steps are being taken to correct that situation.

The point I make is that it was a matter of administration, and there should have been no necessity for any change in the law. It seems to me the situation

should have been recognized a long time ago and corrected under the present law by the Selective Service Administration.

Mr. PEPPER. I am sure that the principle I have tried to suggest, namely, the utilization of labor inspectors, is very widely employed in England. Under their set-up they have inspectors going to the plants and factories and picking up just such information as the able Senator from Missouri has pointed out concerning men who are being deferred but who ought not to be deferred. The inspectors thereupon notify the appropriate draft board of the man that he should be eligible for service.

Mr. President, there is a converse case to the one the able Senator from Missouri has pointed out, which has been called to my attention from several sources; that is, there will be boys from Florida, let us say, who will be working in Chattanooga in some kind of a war factory. Those boys will be actively engaged in essential war work, but when the draft board in Florida has its quota to fill, it is sometimes reluctant to honor the deferment of such a boy who is up in Chattanooga, and send the boys who are at home off to war. Sometimes they do disservice to industry by not deferring when they should defer, which has, to my personal knowledge, led a great many industries to hire men to do nothing except go around all over the country and see the draft boards about deferment. These men try to explain to the draft boards back home that the men are engaged in essential war work. So it really works both ways.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Mr. President, if the Senator will yield, I recognize that would be another defect fully as bad as the one I have pointed out, and we all recognize that it would be undesirable to allow a man to shop around—that is, to go from a board where his number might be high and put his credentials under another board where his number might be lower in the draft. But it does seem to me that under the existing law there is no excuse for a lack of overall supervision to correct those evils and to bring about the proper utilization of the manpower of this country, to the end that men who should be in the Army should not be deferred, and, on the other hand, that men should be deferred for such essential industries as farming, the production of food for the fighting forces, which to my mind is fully as important as the manufacture of munitions, or, so far as that is concerned, as important as fighting. It seems to me there has been a complete break-down of the over-all supervision.

Mr. PEPPER. Is the able Senator from Missouri assuming that the War Manpower Commission has in its own right authority to defer for occupational reasons?

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. The Selective Service System has, the President has.

Mr. PEPPER. Yes; but as I understand, that is an individual matter.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. The President of the United States set up the Manpower Commission. There was no stat-

utory provision for the Manpower Commission. The President of the United States set it up, and under his general wartime authority he could have given them any authority he pleased.

Mr. PEPPER. I venture to say that there is some question about that, at least the way it is working now, because I knew of a case recently where, although there had been a request for deferment by the War Manpower Commission, sanctioned by the President, the draft board did not honor the request.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Will the Senator yield?

Mr. PEPPER. In just a moment. If the individual affected were to file a request for deferment, and that request were turned down by the local draft board, he could take an appeal, and the President upon appeal could, of course, give the man favorable action, and therefore deferment, upon his own petition. But that power is not, to my knowledge, vested in the War Manpower Commission, or in any other Federal agency.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Will the Senator permit me to read the language of the law?

Mr. PEPPER. Yes, I shall be glad to have it.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. It is paragraph (e) of section 5—

Mr. PEPPER. Of the Selective Service Act?

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Of the Selective Service Act.

It provides:

The President is authorized, under such rules and regulations as he may prescribe, to provide for the deferment from training and service under this act in the land and naval forces of the United States of those men whose employment in industry, agriculture, or other occupations or employment, or whose activity in other endeavors, is found in accordance with section 10 (a) (2) to be necessary to the maintenance of the national health, safety, or interest.

Of course, as the Senator from Missouri has pointed out, the Manpower Commission is a creation of the President, and this is one of the regulations which the President has been given power to make under this very act.

Mr. PEPPER. The Senator is no doubt right in reference to the possible power of the President, but as the system now operates, the War Manpower Commission, as I believe the able Senator will agree, is not exercising that power.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Certainly I agree to that.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. That is the occasion for the proposed legislation.

Mr. PEPPER. But the proposed legislation does not give the War Manpower Commission power to require occupational deferment; it merely creates a blanket deferment by the Congress.

The proposed legislation is not pursuant to the directive of the President, or the power of the President. It is not proposed that the President's power be actually employed by the Manpower Commission. The proposal is merely to set up a blanket statutory deferment, which would not solve anything, including the labor problem.

Mr. DANAHER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. PEPPER. I yield.

Mr. DANAHER. The Senator's last proposed amendment causes me some concern. As I understand, it would, under the authority of the proposal, authorize the creation of a corps of inspectors who could enter into factories, let us say everywhere, to ascertain whether or not proper use of the available manpower was being made within those factories. Am I correct in that understanding?

Mr. PEPPER. It was intended not to direct, but to authorize the War Manpower Commission to do it, because it was felt that there should be some way of determining whether an employer was making a reasonably efficient use of his labor. Does the Senator think that is not a wise suggestion?

Mr. DANAHER. I think it is not, if the Senator will let me answer the question categorically, and proceed to ask the Senator if he has made inquiry to ascertain whether or not the division of factory inspection in the Department of Labor is not now already equipped to do the very thing he proposes?

Mr. PEPPER. I did not realize that they were to do it upon quite the same background as my proposal would authorize the War Manpower Commission to do it. I was influenced largely by England's experience in connection with these labor inspectors. A few days ago I was talking to the head of a steel firm in Cleveland and I mentioned this suggestion about labor inspectors. He said, "I think that is an excellent suggestion. It is only fair that employers do make efficient use of their labor."

Let me call attention to something which happened in my State a few days ago, or so I am told. I do not mean to charge the employer with the facts unless they exist. I was told that a shipmaker put a notice in the paper that he was going to pay skilled wages for semiskilled labor and semiskilled wages for unskilled labor. The result was that several thousand workers poured out of other war industries in that community into this man's shipyard. He put them all to work, kept them on the pay roll a week or 10 days or 2 weeks, then screened them, turned off all the poorer workers, taking the whole number as it then existed, and had an improved labor supply when he got through. Yet he demoralized labor conditions in his community.

Somehow or other it seems to me that kind of thing should be prevented. If there were an admonition on the part of Congress to the War Manpower Commission to require every one who is using labor to make reasonable use of it, at least before he can take on other labor, I think it would be in the interest of the economical use of the Nation's manpower.

If I am wrong about that, in the consensus of Senators, I should be very glad to leave this suggested provision out of the amendment, because I do not want controversial questions brought into the amendment.

Mr. DANAHER. I think we are striving for the same common objective. If in fact what the Senator seeks to achieve is being done or can be done by existing authority, I am sure the Senator has no desire to provide for an additional corps of inspectors.

Mr. PEPPER. I do not. If the Senator feels that there is another agency of the Government adequately covering this field, I shall ask to withdraw the proposal I have just offered.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator has that right.

Mr. PEPPER. Let me direct the able Senator's attention to another amendment which I desire to offer to my amendment providing:

The Chairman of the War Manpower Commission is authorized and directed to develop programs and provide medical care and other assistance for rehabilitating persons deferred from military training and service because of physical disability.

My reason for venturing to bring that up for consideration is that the number of selectees rejected through January 1943 amounted to 2,542,626. Those inducted through selective service numbered 4,054,000. Those who volunteered through selective service numbered 2,217,000. The total of the two references I have just given amounted to 6,271,000. About 30 percent were rejected for physical reasons.

Dr. Parran was before our committee, and in speaking on this subject he testified that except for certain venereal cases, all but a few hundred of all those rejected for physical reasons had been rehabilitated for service, and therefore made eligible, many a father having to go to war today in this country, and leave his wife and children, because of illiteracy and because of physical deficiencies which have required deferment. In many cases, Dr. Parran testified, the physical defects could be removed and men rejected made eligible for military service.

If Senators think that is a controversial subject, that it might get into the question of the means, I do not want to inject it into the consideration.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. PEPPER. I yield.

Mr. VANDENBERG. The Senator's latest objective is obviously highly worthy, but it seems to me that it opens up the entire subject of civilian rehabilitation, concerning which there is a very desperate controversy.

Mr. PEPPER. The Senator is correct. Mr. VANDENBERG. If the Senator will stick to what he has, he has a simple proposition, namely, a congressional directive for an over-all agreement among responsible Government heads for an appropriate allocation of our total manpower, and authority to the Manpower Commission even to defer occupational groups if ultimately that is necessary in order to meet the quotas. Let us stop right there.

Mr. PEPPER. Very well.

Mr. VANDENBERG. It is just as simple as can be.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, I have practically concluded what I wished to say. So far as I am concerned, unless other Senators are disposed to discuss the question, I am ready for a vote on it.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. PEPPER. I should like to ask for a quorum call, and have an opportunity thereafter for 5 minutes to explain the present status of the amendment, and then I am disposed to have a vote on it.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. I wish to ask the Senator about section 7 of the amendment. I have not heard the Senator withdraw that yet.

Mr. PEPPER. Yes; I thought I did.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Section 7 is out?

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, if I have not already requested the privilege of deleting section 7, I now make that request.

Mr. BANKHEAD. What sections are left?

Mr. PEPPER. That leaves only sections 2 and 3, Mr. President, and they should appropriately, of course, be numbered sections 1 and 2. I ask that the amendment be modified in that respect, Mr. President.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be so modified.

Mr. PEPPER. Unless some other Senator wishes to address himself on the subject matter I would like to suggest the absence of a quorum. Did the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. DANAHER] wish to speak?

Mr. DANAHER. Yes, Mr. President.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, I should like an opportunity for a brief explanation of the amendment after a quorum call shall be had, and before there is a vote on it, in order to advise Members of the Senate what is in the amendment as it is now modified.

Mr. DANAHER. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. DANAHER. Has there been an agreement with respect to allocation of time to a point that if I should speak at this time I would be trespassing upon the time of some other Senator?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. There has been no agreement as to the allocation of time.

Mr. DANAHER. Mr. President, there is a related phase of this whole war manpower problem which, it seems to me, might best be high-lighted by my taking an actual case history which I have very carefully sought to authenticate in its every aspect. Under date of January 15, I received from the Forsberg Manufacturing Co., of Bridgeport, Conn., a letter which set forth that under date of December 10, 1942, the Navy Department had opened negotiation No. 2386, which called for the manufacture of 311,800 hacksaw frames. The letter complained to me that this particular firm was the lowest bidder of all those submitting bids throughout the country for this particular negotiation, notwithstanding which it was denied the contract on the ground that Bridgeport, Conn., had been classified by the War Manpower Commission

to be a critical labor area, and therefore that no contract could be allocated to the Forsberg Manufacturing Co. within that area.

Let us stop right there for a moment, Mr. President, while we ask ourselves exactly what that means to the Forsberg Manufacturing Co. I have had reported to me prior and similar instances of concerns which had been the lowest bidders within a given critical manpower area, but which were denied the contracts. As a result, being unable to obtain any materials with which to engage in normal civilian production, and being unable to secure any war contracts because of the critical labor area ruling, the individual concern simply had to go out of business, and all its personnel, its labor pool, had to be dissipated to other factories and other industries within the area. I feared that might happen to the Forsberg Co.

In order to authenticate the facts, I sent the company's letter to the Navy Department, and under date of February 4 I received from Mr. James Forrestal, Under Secretary of the Navy, a letter identifying the particular negotiation and the correspondence, and I quote from it:

The facts as presented by the company to you are correct.

The decision of the Navy Department in this particular case was controlled by Directive No. 2 of the War Production Board as amended October 10, 1942, which ordered the armed services not to place contracts in areas designated as group 1 by the War Manpower Commission.

Mr. President, one can see the limits to which the War Manpower Commission authority extends when it can say that within a given area the supply of labor is deemed to be inadequate to meet the demand either currently or within the following 6 months, and that consequently no war contract may be let within that area.

The War Production Board, through its Allocations Section, Mr. President, is bound by the certification of the War Manpower Commission. Consequently the Navy, Mr. Forrestal went on to advise, had to search for and discover another manufacturing company which could supply the particular hacksaw frames. It made no difference that the concern receiving the contract submitted a bid which was higher, or that the company was located a thousand miles away; so long as the company which was the lowest bidder is within a critical manpower area, it cannot have the contract, and the Navy, under the War Manpower Commission's directive, must place the contract elsewhere.

That certainly presented an interesting situation. So I took the matter up with the War Production Board and asked their advice as to what the situation was as W. P. B. saw it, and under date of February 12 I received a letter, from which I will read in part:

Your recent letter outlining the problem of the Forsberg Manufacturing Co., in Bridgeport, Conn., was discussed at a recent meeting of the Critical Labor Area Appeals Board. This Board is composed of representatives of the War Manpower Commission and of the Procurement Policy Division, the Smaller War

Plants Division, and the Labor Production Division of the War Production Board, who are engaged in a continuous study of the effect of present procurement policies in critical labor areas.

A summary of the Board's conclusions to date indicates that the basic problem is to use the manufacturing skill, ingenuity, and equipment found in critical labor areas to make the maximum impact against the enemy. The power of this impact should not be dissipated in producing items which can be readily secured in other sections of the country where they have ample facilities and labor surpluses. One exemption has already been made for small business since it is realized that small business is an essential part of our war and peace economy.

The suggested procedure outlined in your letter would make another exemption, after investigation, for firms able to produce the goods mentioned in the contract without further burden on the local labor market.

Mr. President, I digress at this point to say that I had suggested, in effect, that the local representative of the War Production Board should make inquiry within the area to ascertain whether or not the successful bidder in fact had an ample labor pool, in fact had machinery and industrial ability sufficient to execute the contract, and could make delivery on time. If all those conditions existed, and if the company could deliver on time, that is exactly what the Navy or any other procurement arm actually desired. So, it seemed to me that if the execution of the contract could be accomplished without impact adversely on the labor supply in the given area, why not let the War Production Board agent on the ground ascertain the facts and certify accordingly?

The War Production Board advised with reference to that suggestion:

This would increase the amount of business coming into a critical labor area after consideration of the labor requirements of individual manufacturers, but without consideration of the labor demands of the man across the street. A critical labor area is, by definition, an area in which there are more jobs than men; an area in which the maximum in-migration has already occurred with resulting strain on housing and transportation facilities. The Board believes it impossible for a manufacturer to guarantee that his labor will remain constant during a given contract, for no manufacturer can control the action of the local draft boards.

I will digress again, Mr. President, to say that that is the weakest point in the entire chain, because if such an argument can be applied as to deny a contract to the low bidder, the same argument certainly applies to the successful higher bidder who ultimately obtains the contract.

I resume reading the letter:

As Selective Service pulls a worker out of a plant, replacements must come from the more efficient use of present employees; or additional labor must be obtained from the unemployed, from new workers such as women and high-school graduates coming into the market, or from the transfer of workers from less essential work to the more essential work of war production.

Mr. President, I shall not read the remainder of the letter, which deals with a completely different aspect of the situation; but, equipped with the views of the War Production Board, and finding that

the War Manpower Commission was, after all, the key to the whole problem, I took the matter up with the War Manpower Commission, and under date of February 26 Mr. Paul V. McNutt wrote:

Receipt is acknowledged of your letter of February 6, with which you enclose a copy of one of January 15, 1943, from President H. S. Forsberg of the above company, protesting the classification by the War Manpower Commission of Bridgeport as a critical labor-shortage area.

I believe that the following information, together with the attached news release, will be responsive to Mr. Forsberg's comment, and will explain both to you and to him the position of the War Manpower Commission in matters of this kind.

In collaboration with the War Production Board, the War Department, the Navy Department, the Treasury Department, the Maritime Commission, and other interested groups, and on a basis of careful analysis of labor-market conditions, the War Manpower Commission has certified which labor-market areas have the greatest abundance of workers together with those in which labor shortages now exist and those in which shortages are anticipated. Factual information for our purposes is gathered by the extensive field organization of the Commission, and includes present and future demand for workers expressed to us through the United States Employment Service by employers in each area, with additional data from the Selective Service as to withdrawals that will be made from the area.

The estimated supply of workers is based on the number presently registered with the Employment Service, plus estimate of additional workers normally in the labor market but not registered, and those who could be attracted into the labor market by intensive recruiting campaigns.

Since our reports will be revised each month, changes in the situation in a given area will be subject to review at each monthly report. The facts entering into our certification in respect to these areas have been discussed with local representatives of both management and labor.

In conformity with these certifications, recommendations are made for the assigning of contracts in order to mobilize our total labor resources for the war effort into localities, wherever possible, in which resident labor now has little or no opportunity to contribute to the war program. To do otherwise would compound the already serious problems we have of expanding community facilities of housing, schools and utilities because of in-migration of workers in excess of the capacity of the community to absorb them. On the other hand, it is only fair, as well as in the interest of efficiency, to assign these war contracts to cities and areas which now have facilities for such work and wherein is found a surplus of workers who are willing and anxious to do their share, but thus far for one reason or another have either been overlooked or unable to participate.

We all greatly regret that this or any action of governmental agencies should result in financial or economic loss to any individual, firm, or city. However, I know of no means for wholly avoiding such disturbances of normal life and conditions which are due only to the war.

Sincerely,

PAUL V. McNUTT, Chairman.

Mr. President, the picture set up in this file bears markedly on the issue raised by the Senator from Florida [Mr. PEPPER]. The problem is related also to the arguments which have been made by the Senator from Vermont [Mr. AUSTIN] and

other Senators. We have yet to find an appropriate solution for the threat to our economy when a successful and thriving industry, so efficiently operated that it is, in fact, the lowest bidder on a procurement contract, can not only be deprived of the opportunity to be awarded the contract, but, after having spent a lifetime in training its workers, must see them dispersed into a labor pool to be trained again in new tasks by another industry while the erstwhile employing concern becomes a war casualty. It is a striking situation, Mr. President. Mr. McNutt concludes his letter with expressions of regret that such a war casualty must result, and that he knows of no means of avoiding such disturbances. It does not seem fair.

In the little town of Berlin, Conn., there was a company called the Prentice Manufacturing Co. It made nothing but Talon zippers. It was the low bidder on a Government contract. The company did not receive the contract because it was located in a critical labor area. Someone downtown not known to you or me decides that somewhere else, in some other community, there is a labor pool available to manufacture Talon zippers; so the Prentice Co., with its 650 employees, must fold up and its employees must be absorbed into some other war industries, perhaps many miles away, while the Prentice Co., the low bidder, becomes a war casualty.

I have in mind a concern in Hartford, Conn., which in January of this year lost a \$21,000,000 contract under circumstances identical with those which I have described. That there is need, in solving the war manpower problem, for a greater utilization of all affected departments and a more efficient coordination of them in their demands upon the available labor pool becomes apparent. Whether we could achieve it under the proposal of the Senator from Florida, I do not know, but it strikes in the right direction. It is high time that there should be greater coordination among the authorities who are charged with the responsibility of organizing our economy for war-time production.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there be printed in full in the RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks the letters from which I have read, in order that the entire case file may appear in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the letters were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE FORSBERG MANUFACTURING Co.,
Bridgeport, Conn., January 15, 1943.
Hon. JOHN A. DANAHER,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: We feel you will be interested in our experience in bidding on a Navy Department bid, and we would appreciate any assistance you can give us in connection with it.

This was bid, negotiation No. 2386, which opened December 10, 1942, at 10 a. m., on an item of "Frames, hacksaw."

The total quantity was 311,800 frames, and we bid from 26 to 28 cents each, depending upon point of delivery, so that we were the lowest bidder on the contract. In

addition, the deliveries specified in bid were guaranteed by us when we quoted.

Nevertheless, we have been informed that because Bridgeport is in the "black" area as regards manpower, we will not be awarded the contract and it will be given to another bidder.

In view of the fact that we have the manpower to make delivery on the contract, the necessary equipment and facilities, and the item of hacksaw frames is a standard one with us, as we have been making this item for the past 25 years, we feel we are being penalized by being denied this contract, simply because some other manufacturers are overloaded with war work.

We contacted the local War Production Board office, and, upon explaining the situation to them, found their reaction was the same as ours in that the order prohibiting the letting of any contracts to Bridgeport is too general. It is felt that when a Bridgeport manufacturer bids, if he is the lowest bidder, a check should be made with him or the local War Production Board to see that he can deliver, instead of automatically awarding the contract to a bidder in another city.

Your consideration of this situation will be sincerely appreciated, as we are most anxious to be awarded this contract for hacksaw frames, and will hope for an early response from you.

Yours very truly,

H. S. FORSBERG,
President.

THE SECRETARY OF THE NAVY,
Washington, February 4, 1943.
The Honorable JOHN A. DANAHER,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SENATOR DANAHER: Negotiation No. 2386, which you called to our attention in your letter of January 18, 1943, and in which the Forsberg Manufacturing Co. was denied a contract because its plant was located in an area of acute labor shortage, has been reviewed by this office.

The facts as presented by the company to you, are correct.

The decision of the Navy Department in this particular case was controlled by directive No. 2 of the War Production Board, as amended October 10, 1942, which ordered the armed services not to place contracts in areas designated as group I by the War Manpower Commission.

In its release of December 3, 1942, the War Manpower Commission states as follows: "Group I—Areas in which the supply of labor is inadequate to meet the demand, currently or within the ensuing 6 months. Further supply contracts should not be awarded in these areas if facilities for meeting the requirements of such contracts are available in other areas."

Acting in accordance with these instructions, the Bureau of Supplies and Accounts searched for and discovered another manufacturing company which had facilities and could supply the frames. This company had already bid on the contract, but its bid was slightly higher than the bid of the Forsberg Manufacturing Co. The price was renegotiated down to the amount of the lowest bid. The contract was awarded to the company which had the facilities and was not located in a group I area.

The above action by the Bureau of Supplies and Accounts was entirely consistent with existing War Production Board instructions. Other companies in group I areas have entered complaints similar to that of the Forsberg Manufacturing Co., and accumulated criticisms have been presented to the War Production Board through its Procurement Policy Board for consideration relative

to a possible liberalization of the current directive. Pending further action on the part of the War Production Board, the Navy Department will continue to follow existing instructions.

We appreciate very much your interest in bringing this case to our attention, for it is just through such means that we are able to make representations to the War Manpower Commission and the War Production Board so that these problems can be solved.

In accordance with your wish, I am returning the letter from the Forsberg Manufacturing Co.

Sincerely,

JAMES FORRESTAL,
Under Secretary of the Navy.

FEBRUARY 6, 1943.

WAR PRODUCTION BOARD,
Washington, D. C.

GENTLEMEN: The Forsberg Manufacturing Co. in Bridgeport, Conn., bid on negotiation No. 2386, opening December 10, 1942, and was the lowest bidder. The contract, however, was awarded to a higher bidder. The company advises that the local War Production Board officials seemed to agree with the bidder that the War Manpower Commission order prohibiting the letting of any contracts to Bridgeport is too general, and apparently your local office feels that a check could be made with the local board to ascertain whether or not a given bidder can deliver in accordance with the specifications of the negotiation rather than have Washington automatically award the contract to a higher bidder in some other city. I took the matter up with the Navy Department, which advises that the facts set forth by the Forsberg Manufacturing Co. are correct.

Apparently, then, the whole matter turns on a question of policy, and I will very greatly appreciate whatever comments you are in position to give me as to the basic problem.

Faithfully yours,

JOHN A. DANAHER.

WAR PRODUCTION BOARD,
Washington, D. C., February 12, 1943.
Hon. JOHN A. DANAHER,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SENATOR DANAHER: Your recent letter outlining the problem of the Forsberg Manufacturing Co., in Bridgeport, Conn., was discussed at a recent meeting of the Critical Labor Area Appeals Board. This board is composed of representatives of the War Manpower Commission and of the Procurement Policy Division, the Smaller War Plants Division, and the Labor Production Division of the War Production Board, who are engaged in a continuous study of the effect of present procurement policies in critical labor areas.

A summary of the board's conclusions to date indicates that the basic problem is to use the manufacturing skill, ingenuity, and equipment found in critical labor areas to make the maximum impact against the enemy. The power of this impact should not be dissipated in producing items which can be readily secured in other sections of the country where they have ample facilities and labor surpluses. One exemption has already been made for small business since it is realized that small business is an essential part of our war and peace economy.

The suggested procedure outlined in your letter would make another exemption, after investigation, for firms able to produce the goods mentioned in the contract without further burden on the local labor market. This would increase the amount of business coming into a critical labor area after consideration of the labor requirements of individual manufacturers, but without consideration of the labor demands of the man across the street. A critical labor area is, by definition, an area in which there are more jobs than men; an area in which the maximum in-migration has already occurred with re-

sulting strain on housing and transportation facilities. The board believes it impossible for a manufacturer to guarantee that his labor will remain constant during a given contract, for no manufacturer can control the action of the local draft boards. As Selective Service pulls a worker out of a plant, replacements must come from the more efficient use of present employees; or additional labor must be obtained from the unemployed, from new workers such as women and high school graduates coming into the market, or from the transfer of workers from less essential work to the more essential work of war production.

To speed up the transfer of workers from less essential to more essential work the War Manpower Commission has already designated a list of occupations whose workers will not be deferred on account of dependency when called by Selective Service. It has furthermore established the 48-hour week in all critical labor areas and has recommended that all hiring of workers in critical labor areas shall be done on a system of job priorities through the local United States Employment Service commencing April 1, 1943.

The Smaller War Plants Division of the War Production Board is attacking the problem from another angle. They have taken two key areas in the State of Connecticut—New Britain and Bridgeport. In both instances they have visited and have a list of all important companies engaged in war production. They have looked at the backlog of orders and the number of additional men each manufacturer will require in the next 6 months. Since no more in-migration is possible, these men must come from other employers in that area or a plan must be devised to share the work. Accordingly, the Smaller War Plants Division examines the requisitions for new critical tools by all companies asking for additional labor. They then compare this requisition with their records of similar machine tools in the area that are not fully engaged in war production. The next step is to wash out the new tool demand by spreading subcontracts on the backlog of orders to those concerns who have similar tools and who are not working at maximum production. After this process is carried out within the area so that every firm in the New Britain or Bridgeport area is working at maximum capacity on prime contracts or subcontracts, it then may be necessary to place any additional backlog in other labor areas which are less critical.

The above procedure will have direct bearing on the problem of the Forsberg Manufacturing Co. I am advised that the Smaller War Plants Division is working on their particular problem. You will be interested to learn that last week, after completing a thorough investigation of Tuttle & Bailey, New Britain, the Smaller War Plants Division certified them to the Navy as prime contractors.

Yours very truly,

TUDOR BOWEN,
Deputy Director.

UNITED STATES SENATE,
COMMITTEE ON FINANCE,
February 6, 1943.

MR. PAUL V. McNUTT,
Chairman, War Manpower Commission,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. McNUTT: Under date of January 15, Mr. H. S. Forsberg, president of the Forsberg Manufacturing Co., Bridgeport, Conn., wrote me pointing up the very difficult situation now confronting many plants in so-called critical areas. I had sent his communication to the Navy Department and now have at hand a reply from Mr. James Forrestal, Under Secretary of the Navy, who says that the facts presented are correct. Apparently, the Bureau of Supplies and Accounts in the Navy is governed in its action by some ruling of the War Manpower Commission.

I shall appreciate having at hand your best advice in this matter, to the end that I might make adequate reply.

Thank you very much for your courtesy and cooperation.

Faithfully yours,

JOHN A. DANAHER.

FORSBERG MANUFACTURING CO.,
BRIDGEPORT, CONN.

OFFICE FOR
EMERGENCY MANAGEMENT,
WAR MANPOWER COMMISSION,
Washington, D. C., February 26, 1943.

Hon. JOHN A. DANAHER,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SENATOR: Receipt is acknowledged of your letter of February 6, with which you enclosed a copy of one of January 15, 1943, from President H. S. Forsberg of the above company, protesting the classification by the War Manpower Commission of Bridgeport as a critical labor shortage area.

I believe that the following information, together with the attached news release, will be responsive to Mr. Forsberg's comments and will explain both to you and to him the position of the War Manpower Commission in matters of this kind.

In collaboration with the War Production Board, the War Department, the Navy Department, the Treasury Department, the Maritime Commission and other interested groups, and on a basis of careful analysis of labor market conditions, the War Manpower Commission has certified which labor market areas have the greatest abundance of workers together with those in which labor shortages now exist and those in which shortages are anticipated. Factual information for our purposes is gathered by the extensive field organization of the Commission, and includes present and future demand for workers expressed to us through the United States Employment Service by employers in each area, with additional data from the Selective Service as to withdrawals that will be made from the area. The estimated supply of workers is based on the number presently registered with the Employment Service, plus estimate of additional workers normally in the labor market but not registered, and those who could be attracted into the labor market by intensive recruiting campaigns.

Since our reports will be revised each month, changes in the situation in a given area will be subject to review at each monthly report. The facts entering into our certification in respect to these areas have been discussed with local representatives of both management and labor.

In conformity with these certifications, recommendations are made for the assigning of contracts in order to mobilize our total labor resources for the war effort into localities, wherever possible, in which resident labor now has little or no opportunity to contribute to the war program. To do otherwise would compound the already serious problems we have of expanding community facilities of housing, schools, and utilities because of in-migration of workers in excess of the capacity of the community to absorb them. On the other hand, it is only fair, as well as in the interest of efficiency, to assign these war contracts to cities and areas which now have facilities for such work and wherein is found a surplus of workers who are willing and anxious to do their share, but thus far for one reason or another have either been overlooked or unable to participate.

We all greatly regret that this or any action of governmental agencies should result in financial or economic loss to any individual, firm, or city. However, I know of no means for wholly avoiding such disturbances of normal life and conditions which are due only to the war.

Sincerely,

PAUL V. McNUTT,
Chairman.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, what is the pending question?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the modified amendment proposed by the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. KILGORE] for the Senator from Florida [Mr. PEPPER] as a substitute for the amendment of the Senator from Colorado [Mr. JOHNSON].

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. President, will the Senator from Florida withhold his suggestion of the absence of a quorum for a moment?

Mr. PEPPER. Certainly.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. President, I should like to ask the Senator from Florida a question relating to section 3 of his proposed substitute, to see if I correctly understand his amendment. As I understand the amendment, in section 2 he sets up a board of officials. Then I find this language in section 3:

(1) whenever the Chairman of the War Manpower Commission deems it necessary in order to meet the program determined in accordance with section 2 of the Manpower Mobilization Act that occupational deferments be granted to persons engaged in military or essential civilian production or in essential activity related thereto, he shall make a finding—

Mr. PEPPER. Pardon me, I inserted the words "subject to review by the President" at that point.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. That is what I wanted to find out—whether it would make the chairman of the War Manpower Commission the czar of everything.

Mr. PEPPER. No; I asked and received permission to insert at that point the words "subject to review by the President."

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Since that proviso has been inserted, I wonder what the objective and effect of the section would be. In the original act the President has already been given that power. Then to restate that he has the power, when it is obvious that he has it, and when the law already states that he has it, makes me wonder what the objective of section 3 is, and I wonder if the Senator will agree to withdraw the section?

Mr. PEPPER. My purpose is to deal with a fact, not a theory. We are dealing with a situation which the President has not already seen fit to provide for—namely occupational deferment by an agency other than the draft boards. Congress, when faced with that problem, would simply be enacting here a provision that the authority is reposed in the chairman of the War Manpower Commission, but we do not, of course, attempt to deprive the President of his power to supervise or review all action of the War Manpower Commission.

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. PEPPER. I yielded to the able Senator from Colorado, and next I will yield to the able Senator from Massachusetts.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. I just do not understand the necessity for add-

ing that language there. There is nothing mandatory in section 3. I do not see that there is anything mandatory in section 2; but certainly there is nothing mandatory in section 3. If the President does not exercise the powers that we gave him in the original Selective Service Act, I do not understand why the Senator thinks he will exercise those powers under this particular language.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, the exercise of the power conferred by this section would not be dependent upon affirmative action by the President. We would impose upon the War Manpower Commission the duty to see to it that proper occupational deferments are brought about. However, we would still leave to the President the power to review the decisions of the War Manpower Commission; but that is quite different from the authority which is vested in the President under the Selective Service Act to do those things affirmatively. The President has not seen fit to do them. The able senior Senator from Alabama has said, therefore, that we should have a blanket deferment of agricultural labor. The able senior Senator from West Virginia [Mr. KILGORE] and I have proposed as a substitute that we confer a statutory duty and power upon the War Manpower Commission to provide for occupational deferment, but, of course, we have not wished to deprive the President of his just power to review the decisions of the War Manpower Director.

We feel that would make it very much stronger, therefore, that the principal objective of the able senior Senator from Alabama and the able senior Senator from Colorado would be achieved in a way better than that which has been used in the past when we have not done something like this.

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. PEPPER. I yield.

Mr. LODGE. As I understand it, the Senator offers sections 2 and 3 as substitutes for the bill; is that correct?

Mr. PEPPER. As substitutes for the pending amendment.

Mr. LODGE. Section 2 provides for a convocation or gathering together of the heads of the various war agencies, and provides for the development by them of a plan for allocation of manpower; is that correct?

Mr. PEPPER. That is correct.

Mr. LODGE. Of course, I believe the President has that power; but certainly it is a praiseworthy goal, whether done by Presidential authority or by statutory enactment.

Section 3 leads me to the conclusion—and I hope the Senator will correct me if I am wrong—that the determination of occupational deferment would be removed entirely from the hands of the local boards.

Mr. PEPPER. That is correct. It does make it the duty of local boards, in respect to occupational deferment, to observe the directive of the War Manpower Commission, which is subject to review by the President. Of course, that

is true only in respect to occupational deferment.

Mr. LODGE. I wish the Senator would tell me what the philosophy behind that is and what the purpose is and what the merit of it is.

Mr. PEPPER. In the first place, that is offered as a substitute for the blanket deferment which is proposed by the able senior Senator from Alabama. In the second place, essentially it provides for the system which, as I understand it, is in vogue in England—that is, there are occupational deferment boards who have the power to provide for and require occupational deferment. It is intended, and presumed, that the occupational deferment boards will be closer in touch with the occupations that they shall deal with than would the draft boards themselves. It is intended that the occupational deferment boards shall pass on the matter of occupational deferment, and that the selective-service boards should pass upon the matter of deferment upon other grounds, as between man and man—questions of dependency, fitness, and other questions of that character.

But certainly, according to my information, the system proposed has been the system used in England, under which they have entrusted the matter of occupational deferment to occupational deferment boards. Since the President's right of review is preserved, it would seem to me that our proposal is much to be preferred over the proposal of the able senior Senator from Alabama, which provides for just a blanket deferment. Our proposal would for the first time make it the duty of the Manpower Commission to enter the field of occupational deferment in his own right but at the same time it would not deprive the President of his supervisory power.

Mr. LODGE. Does the Senator think that the adoption of his amendment would result in there being a really accurate knowledge, somewhere, in some agency of the Government, as to where the labor surplus is and what the nature of it is?

Mr. PEPPER. That is certainly the intention of the amendment, and I think it would go a great deal farther than would the amendment of the able senior Senator from Alabama in achieving that end. That is what should be done.

Mr. LODGE. It seems to me that until we know where the labor surplus is and what the nature of it is, there is not much use in enacting legislation; and, without that knowledge, planning, whether on a voluntary basis or on the basis of coercion, will not accomplish anything.

Mr. PEPPER. It is intended that the over-all board will for the first time, and authoritatively, make that determination and promulgate that knowledge.

Mr. LODGE. I shall not ask the Senator to explain to me why that has not been done, but I think we all have a right to wonder why it has not been done.

Mr. PEPPER. The Senator is kind in relieving me of a duty which I could not discharge.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. PEPPER. I yield.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. I cannot find the language to do the things which the Senator from Massachusetts has been assured the amendment would do. I cannot find anything in the language which provides for doing such things.

Mr. PEPPER. In the first place, it is made the duty of the committee—referring to the over-all Committee on Requirements and Program—and I read now from page 2, beginning in line 3:

This committee shall establish, subject to review and modification by the President, a national program for maximum mobilization of manpower for the military forces and for military and essential civilian production (referred to in this act as the "program"). The program shall take the form of a detailed schedule of military and essential civilian production and specific quotas of manpower to be made available to the military forces and to particular categories of military and civilian production. In preparing the program the committee shall take into account schedules of military and essential civilian production furnished by the Chairman of the War Production Board and the Food Administrator, according to appropriate jurisdiction, statements of manpower requirements for the military forces furnished by the War and Navy Departments, and statements of manpower requirements for military and essential civilian production furnished by the Chairman of the War Manpower Commission and determined by him in cooperation with the Chairman of the War Production Board and the Food Administrator. The quotas of manpower to be made available to the military forces as determined under the program shall supersede present quotas employed under the Selective Training and Service Act of 1940.

And so forth. Those things could not be done, let me say to the able senior Senator from Colorado, without a detailed knowledge of the manpower resources of the country, their distribution, and their character.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. That may be a sensible conclusion, although I do not concur in it. As I see the program which is listed and provided for in the amendment, the Army, the Navy, the War Production Board, and other agencies would simply set up a program such as that which they have already set up. The armed forces, for instance, require something under 11,000,000 men; the War Production Board has a manpower requirement; agriculture has a manpower requirement of from twelve to thirteen million workers; and so on. That is the program. I do not see where the Senator provides for the making of any survey of the existing manpower supply. He is dealing entirely with the demand for manpower, not the supply of manpower.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, the measure does provide for the allocation of the Nation's manpower, and the allocation cannot be made unless the authorities know what the supply is. We cannot divide up critical materials unless we know what we have to divide up.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Florida yield to the Senator from Michigan?

Mr. PEPPER. I yield.

Mr. FERGUSON. Does this amendment anticipate new local boards on deferment along industrial occupational lines?

Mr. PEPPER. Not primarily.

Mr. FERGUSON. How is that function to be performed?

Mr. PEPPER. The War Manpower Commission, I will say to the able Senator. I read from the bottom of page 3:

(3) for purposes of making an individual finding as to occupational deferment, the Chairman of the War Manpower Commission is empowered, subject to direction by the President, to employ the officers or employees of the War Manpower Commission or of any other Federal agency and to establish such additional organization and procedure as he shall deem necessary and proper.

I will say to the Senator that the Chairman of the Commission would have power to set up additional personnel, but it will be noted that emphasis is also upon his using the existing Federal personnel for that purpose.

Mr. FERGUSON. How many employees does the Senator anticipate that would take? Would it take the same number as are now employed on the local boards?

Mr. PEPPER. It would depend on the way the War Manpower Director organized the program. My opinion is that he would accomplish the result essentially by the personnel he already has in his Employment Service, his War Manpower Commission Service, the agricultural activities which are now in existence, the industry committees of the War Labor Board, and that sort of thing.

Mr. FERGUSON. Would these men be on the public pay roll or would they be volunteer employees such as now constitute the draft boards?

Mr. PEPPER. The Director would have authority, in my opinion, to delegate this power or use as instrumentalities volunteer personnel. He would have authority to employ personnel within the scope of his appropriation, although, of course, this measure does not carry any appropriation.

Mr. FERGUSON. How long does the Senator anticipate it will take to set up these boards? Does he think it would do any good to the farmers this spring?

Mr. PEPPER. I think it would function immediately, because the Department of Agriculture already has an organization in every county, and the Director is authorized to delegate this duty of his to other Federal agencies. Of course, since he has already delegated to the Secretary of Agriculture the question of manpower for agriculture, I assume he would immediately do that in this case; he should do it, so that the Food Administrator's representatives in a given area would be the ones who would primarily take the responsibility of achieving occupational deferment. So the plan is subject to immediate utilization.

Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Gillette	Overton
Austin	Gurney	Pepper
Bailey	Hatch	Radcliffe
Ball	Hawkes	Reed
Bankhead	Hayden	Revercomb
Bilbo	Hill	Reynolds
Bone	Holman	Robertson
Brewster	Johnson, Calif.	Scruggs
Bridges	Johnson, Colo.	Shipstead
Brooks	Kilgore	Smith
Buck	La Follette	Taft
Burton	Langer	Thomas, Idaho
Bushfield	Lodge	Thomas, Okla.
Byrd	Lucas	Thomas, Utah
Capper	McCarran	Tobey
Caraway	McClellan	Tunnell
Chavez	McFarland	Tydings
Clark, Idaho	McNary	Vandenberg
Clark, Mo.	Maloney	Van Nuys
Connally	Maybank	Wagner
Danaher	Millikin	Walsh
Davis	Moore	Wherry
Downey	Murdoch	White
Ellender	Nye	Wiley
Ferguson	O'Daniel	Willis
George	O'Mahoney	Wilson

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. McFARLAND in the chair). Seventy-eight Senators having answered to their names, a quorum is present.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, just preliminary to a vote on the pending proposed substitute for the Bankhead amendment as modified, and for the benefit of those Senators who were not on the floor when the modification of the amendment now about to be voted on occurred, I wish to say that all that is now left in the amendment before the Senate is, first, provision for the establishment of a Committee of Requirement and Program, to be established by the Congress, to consist of the Secretary of War, the Secretary of the Navy, the Chief of Staff of the Army, the Chief of Naval Operations, the Chairman of the War Production Board, the Chairman of the War Manpower Commission, the Food Administrator, and the Director of Economic Stabilization, whose duty it shall be to determine the over-all manpower situation in the country, and to make an allocation of manpower resources among the several essential national programs. That is the first provision.

The second provision, which is section 3, provides that the power of occupational deferment is vested in the War Manpower Commission, subject to review by the President. In that way there may be deferment of essential workers in agriculture and industry by the requirement of the War Manpower Commission, which, for the first time, would have that statutory power. Their actions would be subject to review by the President, so that they may be kept in conformity with the national interest and a national program.

Mr. President, this is offered as a substitute for the amendment offered by the able Senator from Alabama, which we venture to believe, proposes only blanket deferment of agricultural labor. Our proposal goes further than that, and provides an affirmative approach to the problem, and at the same time gives the power to achieve deferment of essential workers, which is the principal aim and objective of the amendment of the able Senator from Alabama.

I wish to ask for a roll call at the appropriate time.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Mr. President, I shall vote for the committee substitute for the pending measure and for the final passage of the bill with great reluctance and regret, but vote for it I shall. I say I shall vote for it with reluctance because I recognize the innate difficulties of legislating upon such a matter as this comprehensively, and yet in sufficient detail adequately to cover the subject.

I recognize full well, as everyone else must, that this is a matter which should have been handled by administration rather than by legislation. It is a matter which can properly and adequately be handled by administration, and can only be handled by legislation in the broadest way, and with the greatest difficulty.

I say that I shall vote for the bill with regret, and my regret lies in the fact that, because there has been such a complete and tragic break-down of administration, such a display of absolute incompetence in administration, this broad general legislation, this blanket deferment, as it has been called, has been made necessary.

Mr. President, I stated a few days ago, during an interruption I made of the very able speech of the Senator from Colorado [Mr. JOHNSON], that I feared the passage of the pending bill at this late day was a good deal akin to the proposition of locking the barn door after the horse had been stolen. I have received scores of letters, indeed hundreds, from farmers in my State, telling me that it is really too late to save the farm-labor situation, because of the fact that under the bullheaded policy of interfering with agricultural production heretofore adopted and carried out, most of the effective farm labor, most of the young farm labor, so necessary to operate the farms, has already been drafted and is in the armed forces. Nevertheless, I believe that even now some measure such as can be taken by legislation should be taken in order, so far as possible, to save the agricultural situation in the United States.

It is my belief that the production of food with which to feed the armed forces of the United States, from Iceland to Guadalcanal, from India to England, from north Africa to Ireland, indeed, all over the world, is about as essential as having men in the armed forces to eat the food and fire the guns.

I charge, without fear of successful contradiction, that, except for incompetence in administration, the situation which has now developed of a shortage in food production in the United States would have been recognized a year and a half or 2 years ago, and should never have been permitted to come about. Now it is a question of what can be done to remedy the situation so far as possible.

Let me say that, in my opinion, the adoption by the Congress last fall—in itself a belated measure—of the Tydings amendment, has done a great deal toward the amelioration of the food situation in

the United States, but under the present selective-service system that amendment has not been entirely effective. Each local draft board has been permitted to pursue its own policy, to do as it pleased, with regard to the enforcement and the carrying out of the policy enunciated in the Tydings amendment. I know that in my own home county, St. Louis County, of which St. Louis City is not a part, the population of which is made up largely of truck farmers, who to a large extent feed the city of St. Louis, there are several draft boards. Most of them have carried into effect the purpose and intention of the Tydings amendment. However, I have had complaints from a multitude of citizens of St. Louis County that one draft board has, for reasons of its own, seen fit to disregard the general policy established by the Tydings amendment, and the directives issued thereunder, and it has been impossible to secure any adequate action from the State authorities, or from the Federal authorities in Washington, on the theory that each draft board is independent, and can do as it pleases. That has been true of other boards in my State, and in other sections of the United States.

Let me read a letter which I received a few days ago from a fine, competent young farmer, in order to illustrate the disregard of the spirit of the Tydings amendment and, as a matter of fact, of the letter of the Tydings amendment, on the part of a local draft board on its own motion. This writer says:

I was born and raised on a farm, and now have one of my own. I never did anything else. I have worked hard from sunup to sundown, and have done chores after that. I have made a crop every year—corn, wheat, rye, oats, hay crops, and potatoes—according to the Government farm program. My draft board will not defer me because I do not live on the place, on which there are no buildings. My stock and 154 acres will bring nothing if I am drafted now at this season. What can be done about the situation?

Mr. President, here is the case of a man who never did anything in his life except to work on a farm, who has been a farmer from his boyhood, who finally saved enough money to make a payment on a farm, and who has been running that farm and working on it from sunup to sundown, and therefore, is operating in accordance with the Government farm program; but he cannot erect buildings on his farm which he actually owns and works, and unless he erects a building there or sets up a tent and bivouacs there he is denied a permit.

Mr. President, I cite that case out of a great many which have come to my attention to show that in many instances the local draft boards have completely disregarded the whole spirit and, I believe, the letter of the Tydings amendment.

I said a moment ago, and I repeat, that any prudent management of these vast affairs would have recognized long since that, by the double process of drafting farm labor and of refusing the farmer agricultural implements to take the place of farm labor, a shortage of production was bound to be created. Yet the pow-

ers that be simply believed that by writing down an allotment and a quota on a piece of paper, and making it public, they could bring food products and other farm commodities into production. Of course, anyone who had any sense knew that that could not be done. So I say that, in my opinion, legislation has become a necessity because of the break-down in administrative agencies.

I should say in this connection, Mr. President, that it has been called to my attention today by Colonel Keesling, of the Selective Service System, that a new order has been issued as to appeals in occupational cases which may bring some improvement in the situation I have just described. I cannot understand why such an order, which the Selective Service had the authority to issue, has not been issued long ago, but I should say that the improvement it will bring about is problematical.

Mr. President, I now come to the amendment proposed by the Senator from Florida [Mr. PEPPER]. The Senator from Florida has, as I understand, stricken out of it sections 1, 4, 5, 6, and 7. I may say that, in my opinion, if he would strike out sections 2 and 3 he would very much improve the amendment.

What do sections 2 and 3 provide? Do they correct the situation concerning which the whole country has been complaining? They do not. Do they prescribe any rules for the improvement of that situation? They do not. Do they make for the improvement in administration by discharging the incompetents who have brought about the present tragic condition? They do not. They simply would create a new super-agency, imposed on top of the very agencies which have brought about this situation, and create a few more jobs. They would create a committee on requirements and program—referred to in this act as the committee—which, of course, will have to have an organization of its own, a headquarters of its own, and numerous personnel of its own. That committee would be created under the chairmanship of a director of war mobilization—

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me at that point?

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. I yield.

Mr. PEPPER. I am going to ask that the two and one-half lines providing for the chairmanship of the director of war mobilization to be appointed by the President, may be deleted.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Mr. President, will the Senator repeat the proposed modification of his amendment?

Mr. PEPPER. I shall strike out the following language, beginning in line 5, on page 1:

Under the chairmanship of a Director of War Mobilization to be appointed by the President (referred to in this act as the Director) and—

So there will be no new organization.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Mr. President, I freely admit that anything deleted from this amendment is an improvement, and if the Senator will continue to whittle down his amendment he may whittle it down to a point where it

might not be so objectionable. But with that language deleted let us see what the amendment does. It provides:

There is hereby created a Committee on Requirements and Program (referred to in this act as the "Committee") consisting of the Secretaries of War and Navy, the Chief of Staff of the Army, the Chief of Naval Operations, the Chairman of the War Manpower Commission, the Chairman of the War Production Board, the Food Administrator, and the Director of Economic Stabilization.

Mr. President, who are those men? Who are the functionaries who are to make up this super committee? With the exception of the Stabilization Director, they are the very oligarchists who got us into this tragic situation. They are the men who are absolutely responsible for the confusion and the break-down in administration which makes the proposed legislation necessary.

I am reminded of the story which I heard when I was a boy, about the old fellow who was haled into court for stealing chickens. When his case was called the judge looked down over his "specs" and said, "Are you the defendant in this case?" The old man said, "No, sir; no, sir; nothing like that. I'm just the man that stole the chickens." [Laughter.] And so it is in this case. This new super-administrative agency is to be composed of the very men whose confusion and incompetency have brought about the present situation.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. I yield.

Mr. WALSH. I wish to call the Senator's attention, in view of what he has stated, to lines 3, 4, 5, and 6 on page 2 of the amendment.

This committee—

The committee which the Senator has described—

shall establish, subject to review and modification by the President, a national program for maximum mobilization of manpower for the military forces and for military—

Please note—

and essential civilian production.

I ask the Senator from Missouri what that means to him, and if it does not mean control of almost every civilian activity in the country?

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. It not only means the control of every civilian activity in the country, but it means the control of every military activity in the country.

Mr. WALSH. And also economic activities.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. And also economic activities. It means the control of munitions production; it means—

Mr. WALSH. Does it mean that the committee could close up one industry and open up another?

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. It seems so to me under the provisions of the amendment.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. I yield.

Mr. PEPPER. Is it not very clear to the able Senator from Missouri that "a

Committee on Requirements and Programs," which is to define the needs of the various activities of the Nation essential to the prosecution of the war—

shall establish, subject to review and modification by the President, a national program for maximum mobilization of manpower for the military forces and for military and essential civilian production—

And that this program, as defined in line 7 and the following lines—

shall take the form of a detailed schedule of military and essential civilian production and specific quotas of manpower to be made available.

In other words, it shall determine the manpower needs of the various essential activities of the Nation, military and civilian.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Mr. President, I understood from the explanation of the amendment given by the Senator from Florida that that was his intention. I believe the language beginning on line 7, page 2, referred to by the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. WALSH], is readily susceptible to the construction placed upon it by him.

Mr. President, what would this amendment do? After organizing into another committee the various administrative agencies who are responsible for the present confusion—for the present debacle—it would simply give them authority to do what the President already has authority to do under the law.

The Senator from Colorado [Mr. JOHNSON] read the law a little while ago. I shall read it again because I think it is very important to understand what this so-called palliative of the Senator from Florida would actually do. Subparagraph (e) of section 5 of the present law—the Selective Service Act—is as follows:

(e) The President is authorized, under such rules and regulations as he may prescribe, to provide for the deferment from training and service under this act in the land and naval forces of the United States of those men whose employment in industry, agriculture, or other occupations or employment, or whose activity in other endeavors, is found in accordance with section 10 (a) (2) to be necessary to the maintenance of the national health, safety, or interest.

If any language could be broader than that I am unable to conceive of it.

I read further:

The President is also authorized, under such rules and regulations as he may prescribe, to provide for the deferment from training and service under this act in the land and naval forces of the United States (1) of those men in a status with respect to persons dependent upon them for support which renders their deferment advisable, and (2) of those men found to be physically, mentally, or morally deficient or defective. No deferment from such training and service shall be made in the case of any individual except upon the basis of the status of such individual, and no such deferment shall be made of individuals by occupational groups or of groups of individuals in any plant or institution.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. I yield.

Mr. PEPPER. Is it the point of the able Senator from Missouri that my

amendment is of no avail or not necessary, because the President already possesses the power to do what my amendment provides?

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. My point is that the President already possesses the power to do everything that the amendment of the Senator from Florida would give him authority to do, and if the President has not exercised the power he now has, and the officials appointed under his Executive order have not exercised that power or discretion, then the only thing the Congress can do is not to refer it back to the same officials who have heretofore failed to exercise that power, but by legislation to prescribe as accurately as may be the policies the Congress desires to have carried out.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. I yield.

Mr. PEPPER. Does not the President already have the power to do everything the Bankhead amendment proposes to do?

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Yes, Mr. President. That is precisely what creates the necessity for the Bankhead amendment. The President has the power, but the President has not exercised it. The purpose of the amendment is to say that the Congress wants that done; to put it into legislative form, and make it the duty of the responsible public officials to carry out the announced policy of the Congress. That is the exact purpose and the policy of the Bankhead amendment. If that is not so, I ask the Senator from Alabama to correct me.

Mr. PEPPER. The power to defer for occupational reasons is not vested in the form of board to which the able Senator has referred, but in the chairman of the War Manpower Commission under section 3 of my amendment. The Senator will agree, will he not, that the War Manpower Commissioner does not possess that power.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. I do not understand that he has been specifically given that power by the President. He could have been given it at any time.

Mr. PEPPER. If he were given that power, the authority for occupational deferment would exist by Congressional action.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. The question would be left to the discretion of the administrative officials, who have failed to exercise any discretions which they may have had. The purpose of the Bankhead amendment is to provide in specific legislative terms for meeting the pressing and vital need for the production of food supplies.

Mr. PEPPER. Is it not fair to say that an alternative is provided as between the Bankhead amendment and the amendment now pending, namely if we wish to make a blanket deferment for everybody in agricultural occupations, it may be achieved by the Bankhead amendment, and if it is desired to give statutory authority to the War Manpower Commission to make occupational deferments for agriculture and industry, it may be done through my amendment?

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. The Congress has tried to handle that problem by giving discretion to the Executive. The discretion has not been exercised. The hour in the agricultural situation is now 11 o'clock and 59 minutes. If Congress is to do anything to save the situation, in my opinion it cannot do anything by further beating around the stump and leaving it to someone's discretion. It means postponement, and postponement means failure and futility. If Congress is to do anything, the sooner it does it, the better for all concerned.

Mr. PEPPER. Under the existing administrative set-up does the Food Administrator have the power to require occupational deferment of essential farm workers?

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. I do not understand that he can require it; and I do not understand that he would be able to do so under the amendment of the Senator from Florida.

Mr. PEPPER. In the pending amendment, beginning near the bottom of page 3 is the following language:

(2) for purposes of making an individual finding as to occupational deferment, the Chairman of the War Manpower Commission is empowered, subject to direction by the President, to employ the officers or employees of the War Manpower Commission or of any other Federal agency.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. That merely provides for an additional number of jobs, Mr. President. It does not help out the farm situation.

Mr. PEPPER. If the Senator will allow me to complete my statement, under that language the Chairman of the War Manpower Commission could designate another Federal agency to exercise the power of occupational deferment. If he should delegate the subject of agricultural manpower to the Food Administrator would it not be reasonable to presume that he would also delegate the power of occupational deferment to the Food Administrator? If he should do so, would it not be fair to presume that the Food Administrator would actually require the deferment of essential agricultural labor, taking into consideration the circumstances of each individual case?

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Mr. President, I dare say that every Senator—certainly every Senator from an agricultural State—has had the experience of trying to handle this problem with the administrative agencies. If he calls up one agency he is told that another agency has it in charge. If he calls up the other agency he is told that there will be a joint committee representing all agencies, and that possibly at some time he will receive some relief through that committee. No relief has been afforded, and the situation has grown steadily worse while the administrators have conferred with each other. "Hope deferred maketh the heart sick." While that has been taking place the production of food in the United States has been steadily falling until it has reached the absolute danger point, not only as it relates to the requirements of the civilian population of the United

States, but also the requirements of our armed forces abroad, to say nothing of our obligations to our allies. While I deeply explore the necessity for legislation on the subject at this time, if anything is to be done it can be done only by legislation.

It is said that this is class legislation; and, of course, it is. Any blanket deferment is class legislation. However, it is class legislation not in the interest of the farmers as a class. It is deferment in the interest of a vital necessity of all the people of the United States as well as our allies, to whom we are under obligation to furnish food. This bill should have been passed a long time ago, when the necessity for it developed. Any delay, such as recommitting the bill to the Committee on Military Affairs, as the Senator from Florida [Mr. PEPPER] states he intends to propose, would be a source of very material danger to the well-being of the United States and to the winning of the war.

Mr. CAPPER. Mr. President, I intend to support the pending measure, which is known as the Bankhead bill, as proposed to be amended by the amendment offered by the Senator from Colorado [Mr. JOHNSON]. I sincerely hope the bill will not be amended in such fashion that bureau or agency regulations will be written afterward to destroy its purpose, namely, to keep necessary farm labor on the farm.

The farm problem finally has become recognized, though somewhat belatedly, as a food problem. This means that every one of more than 130,000,000 persons in the United States—plus no one knows how many millions in other lands—has a vital interest in its solution.

When this was merely a farm problem instead of a food problem, only those residing on farms or in close touch with the people living on the 6,000,000 farms in the United States took an active interest in proposed solutions of the problem.

But now, and for the next few years, during the war and for several years following, every one of us will be deeply and feelingly interested in the food problem. Already the pinch is being felt.

Food may become so scarce that rationing of nearly all foods, except possibly bread, is more than likely to become a reality before the end of the present year. I dislike to think what will happen if we have a poor crop year either in 1943 or in 1944.

But, of course, rationing is only the answer to the problem of distributing food.

Rationing will not grow one kernel of wheat or produce one drop of milk or increase by one ounce the amount of beef, pork, lamb, or other meats available. Rationing will not lay one egg, or grow one small potato.

The real answer to the food problem is production of foodstuffs on the 6,000,000-or-so farms in the United States.

To produce food the farmer must have labor; he must have manpower. That labor will produce best if it is skilled, experienced labor. Women and children

from the cities can help to some extent in the harvest; but if we depend too much on that source we will fall down on the job of food production.

The farmer must have machinery and equipment. The W. P. B. ought to be looking forward to increasing the amount of farm machinery manufactured, instead of trying to hold it down to one-fourth of 1940 production. A step has been made. I have been informed recently that production is to be allowed to the extent of one-half the 1940 production.

Many farms must have fertilizers. Livestock and poultry require protein feeds. These must be produced by labor. Oil-bearing crops require labor to produce; and whether we like it or not—though this is not directly involved in the pending legislation—farmers must have good prices to assure continued production at high levels.

The United States is engaged in an all-out, global war.

But we are committed to financing that war to the extent that United States dollar expenditures for war purposes this year will amount to more than the expenditures of all our allies and all our enemies combined. That is hard to believe; but the cold, hard statistics tell us it is a fact.

We are not only financing a large portion of the world in this global war but are also fighting all over the world, and undertaking to feed many millions of people throughout the world, in addition to more than 130,000,000 of our own people.

Latest estimates from the Department of Agriculture on feeding other peoples, which we have undertaken, give some idea of the amount of food which will go out of the country this year.

More than one-half—the estimate is from 50 to 60 percent—of all canned fruit in the United States is to be sent abroad this year, for military and lend-lease purposes. Also almost one-half of all canned vegetables are needed overseas for Allied armed forces and starving civilian populations.

One-fourth of the beef produced this year is to go abroad; 35 to 40 percent of all pork, not including lard; between one-fourth and one-third of the eggs laid in the United States are destined for foreign consumption this year; also one-fifth of the butter, 40 to 45 percent of the cheese, 40 to 50 percent of the condensed and evaporated milk, 25 to 30 percent of the lard, and nearly one-fourth of the other edible fats and oils.

From 35 to 40 percent of dried fruits are reserved for export for military and lend-lease purposes; from 10 to 15 percent of wheat; from 15 to 20 percent of rice. The other day 60,000 tons of foodstuffs were unloaded from one convoy to north Africa.

No wonder we now are threatened with food shortages in many lines. We are warned that all of us must tighten our belts and that before the end of the year it will be patriotic to wear a lean and hungry look.

But despite all this it is not necessary to become unduly alarmed. Huge as are the demands for food, there is no reason for any one starving or facing even near-starvation in the United States if—and I wish to emphasize this point—the farmers of the United States are allowed sufficient labor, sufficient farm machinery and equipment, and, for many farms, fertilizers. Livestock producers must have the necessary protein feeds to enable them to do the job.

Crops must be planted; they must be cultivated in most instances; they must be harvested. Dairy cows have to be fed, cared for, and milked regularly. Eggs and poultry do not just happen; beef and pork come from cattle and hogs, and these must be bred, fed, and cared for intelligently and constantly, then slaughtered and processed before they become food.

I realize that women and children can to some extent replace men on farms. They already have done so, by the thousands and tens of thousands. But in order to feed all our people, and so many billion others to boot, the farms of America apparently need approximately 3,000,000 more workers.

If these men can be obtained without taking any from the armed forces, well and good. I would not keep one needed man out of military service when this Nation is at war. But if food can win the war and help write the peace, the lack of it can certainly prolong the war, and militate greatly against writing the peace. I urge the adoption of the Johnson amendment.

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, will the distinguished Senator from Missouri yield for a question?

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. I do not have the floor, Mr. President. If I had, I should be glad to yield.

Mr. WILEY. Let me say that as I understood the Senator's position, it was in agreement with the position at which I have arrived: First, that under the Selective Service Act adequate power was lodged in the executive branch of the Government to handle the whole manpower situation, but it simply fell down on the job, and the mess that we are in has come about simply because of a failure to do what should have been done.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. That is correct, and that is the only justification for the passage of legislation on the subject, which I admit must necessarily be imperfect and cumbersome.

Mr. WILEY. Very well. We find that the executive branch of the Government has the power, but has not exercised it; we find that the executive branch of the Government has acknowledged that it has not exercised the power. So we pass a law, after 70 percent of the farm help that has left the farms has gone into industry, and 30 percent has gone into the armed forces. Now, when only 250,000 young men are left on the farms, we propose to pass a law saying, "Freeze those young men there." In other words, we give the impression—and that is the danger—that the proposed legislation is a remedy, whereas I understand that the figures show that we have taken off the farms about 1,200,000 men who should have remained there in order to enable

us to obtain the maximum possible production.

The question I wish to ask is whether the Senator thinks that the passage either of the Bankhead law or the adoption of the Bankhead amendment or the Johnson amendment would do the job.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Mr. President, that is the only thing that can be done at this time. I certainly do not think it will restore production to what might have been possible if a more comprehensive policy had been adopted at the time of the inception of the matter; but it seems to me that under the circumstances it is the only thing which can be done.

Let me say that I do not agree with the Senator's figure that there are only 250,000 young men left on the farms. I do not know where the Senator got that figure.

Mr. BANKHEAD rose.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. I yield to the Senator from Alabama.

Mr. BANKHEAD. General Patterson wrote that they would defer 3,000,000 farm workers. I am astonished at the figure the Senator from Wisconsin has given. Why do they object to the passage of the bill if they are going to defer all the farmers, anyway?

Mr. WILEY. I must say that when I listened to the debate several days ago I heard the statement made that there were left on the farms of America only 250,000 single men.

However, let me come to my next question, because I am vitally interested—

Mr. BANKHEAD. Mr. President, permit me to call the Senator's attention to the fact that the bill is not limited to single men. It is true that very few single men yet to be called under the draft are left on the farms. Very few single men are left. The bill covers all men—those from 18 to 38 years of age—wherever they may be.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. President, will the Senator from Wisconsin yield very briefly to me on that point, and then proceed to the next point, if he desires to ask the Senator from Missouri another question?

Mr. WILEY. Yes; I am very happy to yield.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. I have received a telegram sent yesterday, March 16, from a small agricultural county in Colorado. On the 6th day of March, as the Senator will recall, a directive was issued by General Hershey with respect to manpower on the farms—a directive which, by the way, should have been issued immediately upon the passage of the Tydings Act, back on the 13th of November, but it was not issued until the 6th of March. However, 10 days after it was issued we find that this is what happened in this small county in Colorado—the telegram is addressed to me, and comes from Delta, Colo.:

Despite all possible efforts of our county United States Department of Agriculture war boards—

That refers to the county war boards that are set up throughout the country—fifty-eight men left today for military service, 22 of whom were farm workers, some of them essential, and who will need immediate replacement. Of what use is the experience

of the county United States Department of Agriculture war boards if it is not to be used in cases such as these? Some of these men are needed back in this county or our food production goals will suffer. Details of individual cases are available if you wish.

The telegram is signed by Mr. A. F. Hoffman, Jr., secretary of the Delta County U. S. D. A. War Board.

We have heard during the debate that the selective service boards were to be governed by the county war boards in determining whether men were essential on the farms; and yet, 10 days after we were given that assurance, we have evidence that the advice of the county war boards has been completely ignored, and that the selective service boards have paid no attention whatsoever to it.

Of course, the Senator's point is well taken—that we are locking the door after the horse has been stolen. There is no doubt about that—that is, most of the horses have been stolen; there are 300,000 colts left there. Why not keep them?

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I do not agree with the position of any of the Senators who have spoken in that connection. The point I am trying to make is that we have focused the attention of the country and of this body on the retention on the farms of 250,000 single men, when what we should do is focus attention on the problem of how to get more labor, together with adequate machinery, back on the farms. It seems to me that is the proper legislative function.

Mr. BANKHEAD. Mr. President, I should like to ask the Senator again why he confines his argument to single men.

Mr. WILEY. I do not confine my argument to them.

Mr. BANKHEAD. That is the argument the Senator has been making.

Mr. WILEY. No; I have stated the position as we see it and as I heard it related in the Senate, that, practically, under the enlightenment the boards have received, they are not taking off the farms any men except the single men. Am I mistaken about that?

Mr. BANKHEAD. Evidently the Senator is, judging from the telegram which the Senator from Colorado has read.

Mr. WILEY. Oh, no; the telegram does not say that they are taking married men.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. No; there is no distinction as between single men and married men.

Mr. WILEY. Did the telegram say so? Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. No; it did not say anything on that point.

Mr. WILEY. No; it did not. I heard the Senator read it.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. The Senator does not doubt that a great many married men who were on the farms have been drafted; does he?

Mr. WILEY. I agree that they have been drafted. The barn door has been closed after the horses have gone; but I want to get a few more horses back on the farms if I may be pardoned the allusion; and that seems to me to be the way to start solving the problem.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment, as modified, proposed by the Sen-

ator from West Virginia [Mr. KILGORE] on behalf of the Senator from Florida [Mr. PEPPER] as a substitute for the amendment of the Senator from Colorado [Mr. JOHNSON] to the committee substitute.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Alken	Hatch	Radcliffe
Austin	Hawkes	Reed
Bailey	Hayden	Revercomb
Ball	Hill	Reynolds
Bankhead	Holman	Robertson
Billbo	Johnson, Calif.	Scrugham
Brewster	Johnson, Colo.	Shipstead
Bridges	Kilgore	Smith
Brooks	La Follette	Taft
Buck	Langer	Thomas, Idaho
Burton	Lodge	Thomas, Okla.
Bushfield	Lucas	Thomas, Utah
Byrd	McCarran	Tobey
Capper	McClellan	Tunnell
Caraway	McFarland	Tydings
Clark, Idaho	McNary	Vandenberg
Clark, Mo.	Maloney	Van Nuys
Connally	Maybank	Wagner
Danaher	Millikin	Walsh
Davis	Moore	Wherry
Downey	Murdock	White
Ellender	Nye	Wiley
Ferguson	O'Daniel	Willis
George	O'Mahoney	Wilson
Gillette	Overton	
Gurney	Pepper	

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Seventy-five Senators have answered to their names. A quorum is present.

The question is on the amendment, as modified, offered by the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. KILGORE] on behalf of the Senator from Florida [Mr. PEPPER] to the amendment in the nature of a substitute of the Senator from Colorado [Mr. JOHNSON] for the committee substitute. On that question the yeas and nays have been demanded. Is the demand seconded?

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. SMITH. Mr. President, a few days ago I telegraphed the commissioners of agriculture in each of the 48 States and asked them what was their idea or what were the facts as to the prospects of production in 1943 as compared with 1942. I have about 30 replies. They are short, and I ask that they be printed in the RECORD.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the telegrams will be printed in the RECORD.

The telegrams are as follows:

SALT LAKE CITY, UTAH, March 15, 1943.

Senator E. D. SMITH,
Senate Committee on Agriculture,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:
Estimate State average, all crops and livestock, down 5 to 15 percent.
TRACY R. WELLING,
Commissioner of Agriculture,
State of Utah.

SACRAMENTO, CALIF., March 16, 1943.

Senator E. D. SMITH,
Chairman, Committee on
Agriculture, Senate Office
Building, Washington, D. C.:
Reurtel, 15th, I estimate California 1943 production crops and livestock by volume

will not exceed 85 percent 1942 figure. Regards.

W. J. CECIL,
California Director of Agriculture.

DOVER, DEL., March 16, 1943.

Hon. E. D. SMITH,
Committee on Agriculture,
Senate Office Building:
Estimate 10 to 15 percent reduction over all overage in 1943 crops compared with 1942 providing weather conditions favorable.
RALPH C. WILSON,
Secretary, State Board of Agriculture.

TOPEKA, KANS., March 16, 1943.

Senator E. D. SMITH,
Senate Committee on Agriculture:
Kansas food production this year estimate 10 percent less.

J. C. MOHLER,
Secretary.

COLUMBIA, S. C., March 16, 1943.

Hon. E. D. SMITH,
Senate Office Building:
Assuming normal weather general opinion here is 1943 crop production will be approximately 15 percent less than 1942.

J. ROY JONES,
Commissioner of Agriculture.

SPRINGFIELD, ILL., March 16, 1943.

Hon. E. D. SMITH,
United States Senator:
Federal and State statistician estimates that under average conditions production of food crops expected to be 2 percent less than 1942. Estimate beef and milk production about same as 1942. Poultry, eggs, and pork estimated 10 to 20 percent increase.

RAY A. DILLINGER,
Assistant Director,
Illinois Department of Agriculture.

RICHMOND, VA., March 16, 1943.

Hon. E. D. SMITH,
Senate Committee on Agriculture:
Answering your wire will advise that I have previously estimated 15-percent decrease compared with 1942. Complete report will be out March 20.

L. M. WALKER, Jr.,
Commissioner of Agriculture
and Immigration.

CHARLESTON, W. VA., March 17, 1943.

Senator E. D. SMITH,
Chairman, Senate Committee
on Agriculture, Washington, D. C.:
Your wire from best information farm production will be from 20 to 25 percent less than 1942. Goal sign-up of farmers shows about 15 percent less. Victory gardens will be substantially increased over 1942. Farm labor conditions bad and getting worse. Office of Price Administration regulations discourage farmers who could increase production and sell at home. Regards.

J. B. McLAUGHLIN,
Commissioner of Agriculture.

HARTFORD, CONN., March 16, 1943.

Senator E. D. SMITH,
Senate Committee on Agriculture:
Preliminary intention figures for half the counties indicate slight increase in dairy cows with substantial increase in potatoes and poultry. Expect final War Board figures shortly.

OLCOTT F. KING,
Commissioner of Agriculture.

SIoux FALLS, S. DAK., March 16, 1943.

Senator E. D. SMITH:
Your request to South Dakota Department of Agriculture relative production food crops 1943 compared with 1942 was referred to this

office. Production in 1943 depends entirely on acreages seeded and yields per acre. Sorry to advise law prohibits our releasing information relative 1943 intended acreage before official release by Crop Reporting Board of United States Department of Agriculture which will be at 3 p. m. March 19. This early in the season average yields applied to intended 1943 planted acreages is best indication of 1943 production. All such information may be obtained from the Crop Reporting Board which is the source of all official estimates. For your further information practically all armchair snap judgments and hurried surveys by persons and agencies who are inexperienced in crop and livestock forecasting and estimating are grossly in error.

EVAN V. JONES,
Agricultural Statistician for South Dakota.

BOISE, IDAHO, March 17, 1943.

Senator E. D. SMITH,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:
Believe impossible under existing conditions to produce over 80 percent of last year's food production. Farmers very discouraged, only encouragement is good work farm bloc is doing. Keep up the good work. Believe Government restrictions having most hampering effect on production. Farmers will do best possible if given a chance.

HARVEY SCHWENDIMAN,
Commissioner of Agriculture.

OKLAHOMA CITY, OKLA., March 16, 1943.

Senator E. D. SMITH,
Senate Committee on Agriculture:
Estimated percentage production food crops in Oklahoma 1943 as follows: Wheat 10 percent less, corn 8 percent less, oats 12 percent more, barley 15 percent more, rye 10 percent more, peanuts 100 percent more, soybeans 75 percent more, cowpeas 5 percent more, sweetpotatoes 15 percent more, potatoes 35 percent more, peaches 20 percent less, and pears 10 percent less.

JOE C. SCOTT,
President, State Board of Agriculture.

RENO, NEV., March 16, 1943.

Hon. E. D. SMITH,
Senate Office Building:
No accurate information on Nevada crop production for 1943 as compared with 1942 available yet. Opinions obtained from various sources estimate livestock production will be about same with possibly reduction in sheep. Dairy production will be considerably lower with field crops requiring much labor, as much as 25 percent lower. Assurance that labor be made available at early date essential.

GEO. G. SCHWEIS,
Director.

TALLAHASSEE, FLA., March 16, 1943.

Hon. E. D. SMITH,
United States Senate,
Senate Committee on Agriculture:
Present prospects are that the decrease will be about 15 percent. Suggest that you wire H. A. Marks, Federal statistician, Orlando, for further information.

NATHAN MAYO,
Commissioner of Agriculture.

PROVIDENCE, R. I., March 16, 1943.

Senator E. D. SMITH,
Senate Committee on Agriculture:
Increase 10 percent in poultry possible, decrease in vegetables, which will be offset by victory garden production. Anticipate decrease in milk. There was an increase in 1942 over 1941. Picture not as bad as scare-mongers make it. Labor situation serious. Could upset entire farm program.

R. G. BRESSLER,
Director of Agriculture.

MADISON, WIS., March 16, 1943.

Senator E. D. SMITH:

Expected food crop acreage in Wisconsin this year is between 1 and 2 percent higher than last year.

W. H. EBLING,
Statistician, State Department of
Agriculture.

OLYMPIA, WASH., March 16, 1943.

Senator E. D. SMITH:

Doubtful if food production for State of Washington will exceed 90 percent of 1942.

ARTHUR E. COX,
Director of Agriculture.

JACKSON, MISS., March 16, 1943.

Senator E. D. SMITH:

Chairman, Committee on Agriculture,
Senate Building:

Retel. U. S. D. A. War Board farm survey indicates food crop production in 1943 from 95 to 135 percent of 1942 production. Same survey indicates 15 percent reduction farm labor in 1943 below 1942.

S. I. CORLEY,
Commissioner of Agriculture.

AUSTIN, TEX., March 16, 1943.

ELLISON D. SMITH, Chairman:

Texas food crops will be 15 percent less in 1943 than produced in 1942. Seventy-five percent Texas farm area too dry to germinate seed.

J. E. McDONALD,
Commissioner of Agriculture,
State of Texas.

LITTLE ROCK, ARK., March 16, 1943.

Senator E. D. SMITH,

Senate Committee on Agriculture:

Due to unsettled policy regarding farm labor and farm machinery, fertilizer, and prices, impossible to estimate at present percentage decrease in food crops 1943 compared with 1942.

Mrs. LEE WHITE WALTERS,
Secretary, Arkansas Agricultural
Industrial Commission.

HELENA, MONT., March 16, 1943.

Senator E. D. SMITH,

Senate Committee on Agriculture,
Senate Office Building:

According to present indications to plant reports, production food crops the same for 1943 as for 1942, provided growing conditions the same.

ALBERT H. KROUSE,
Commissioner, Agriculture,
Labor, and Industry.

AUGUSTA, MAINE, March 16, 1943.

Senator E. D. SMITH,

Senate Committee on Agriculture:

Re telegram, food production Maine farms 1943 estimated 90 percent of 1942.

CARL R. SMITH,
Commissioner,
Maine Department of Agriculture.

BOSTON, MASS., March 17, 1943.

Senator E. D. SMITH,

Senate Committee on Agriculture:

Re farm production 1943, we expect milk will be down 10 percent, vegetables same acreage as 1942, eggs probably increase 5 or 10 percent, fruit definitely down substantially.

LOUIS A. WEBSTER,
Acting Commissioner.

ATLANTA, GA., March 15, 1943.

Senator E. D. SMITH,

Senate Committee on Agriculture,
Washington, D. C.:

Present prospect crops in Georgia 25 percent reduction in acreage. Shortage of labor, fertilizer, and equipment would make pros-

pect for additional shortage. Weather conditions of course unknown but can hardly expect better weather than 1942. My opinion is prospect for 1943 crop to show reduction between 25 and 50 percent from 1942 production.

TOM LINDER,
Commissioner of Agriculture.

SALEM, OREG., March 15, 1943.

Senator E. D. SMITH,

Senate Committee on Agriculture,
Washington, D. C.:

Your telegram of today referred to Robert Taylor Corvallis, Oregon chairman of war board, who has this matter in hand.

J. D. MICKLE,
Director, Department of Agriculture.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Mr. President, I wish to make a brief statement concerning the vote I am about to cast. I had intended to support the amendment offered by the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. KILGORE], but the Senator from Florida [Mr. PEPPER] has seen fit to modify his amendment and to eliminate from it the only sections which held out any hope of increasing the manpower on the farms. That portion of the amendment having been eliminated, much as I favor bringing some order out of the chaos in the administration of manpower, I cannot accept the residue of the amendment as a substitute for the Bankhead bill, which, at least, will prevent any further military drain upon the farms of the country.

Mr. DANAHER. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. DANAHER. As the pending substitute may now be stated, it includes sections 1, 2, and 3 of the amendment which the Senator from Florida has offered and had printed and lie on the table?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. With certain modifications, that is correct.

Mr. DANAHER. May the modifications be stated?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The modifications will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 3, line 18, after the word "finding", insert "subject to review by the President", and on page 1, strike out, in lines 5, 6, and 7, the words "under the chairmanship of a Director of War Mobilization to be appointed by the President (referred to in this act as the 'Director')".

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, in view of the fact that a number of Senators have come to the floor, and, as it is rather brief, I ask that the amendment, as modified, be read.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the clerk will read, as requested.

The Chief Clerk read as follows:

This act may be cited as the Manpower Mobilization Act.

SEC. 2. There is hereby created a Committee on Requirements and Program (referred to in this act as the "Committee") consisting of the Secretaries of War and Navy, the Chief of Staff of the Army, the Chief of Naval Operations, the Chairman of the War Manpower Commission, the Chairman of the War Production Board, the Food Administrator, and the Director of Economic Stabilization. This committee shall establish, subject to review and modification by the President, a national

program for maximum mobilization of manpower for the military forces and for military and essential civilian production (referred to in this act as the "program"). The program shall take the form of a detailed schedule of military and essential civilian production and specific quotas of manpower to be made available to the military forces and to particular categories of military and civilian production. In preparing the program the committee shall take into account schedules of military and essential civilian production furnished by the Chairman of the War Production Board and the Food Administrator, according to appropriate jurisdiction, statements of manpower requirements for the military forces furnished by the War and Navy Departments, and statements of manpower requirements for military and essential civilian production furnished by the Chairman of the War Manpower Commission and determined by him in cooperation with the Chairman of the War Production Board and the Food Administrator. The quotas of manpower to be made available to the military forces as determined under the program shall supersede present quotas employed under the Selective Training and Service Act of 1940. The schedules of military and essential civilian production and the manpower quotas relating thereto determined under the program shall be binding upon the War Production Board, the Food Administration, the War Manpower Commission, the Office of Economic Stabilization, and other war agencies in their determination and operations relating to production and manpower.

SEC. 3. The Selective Training and Service Act of 1940, as amended, is further amended by adding at the end thereof the following: "Any provision of this act to the contrary notwithstanding—

"(1) whenever the Chairman of the War Manpower Commission deems it necessary in order to meet the program determined in accordance with section 2 of the Manpower Mobilization Act that occupational deferments be granted to persons engaged in military or essential civilian production or in essential activity related thereto, he shall make a finding, subject to review by the President, to this effect and such findings shall be conclusive upon all civilian local boards and any other civilian agencies functioning under this act. No other occupational deferments shall be granted under this act except upon such a finding by the Chairman of the War Manpower Commission;

"(2) for purposes of making an individual finding as to occupational deferment, the Chairman of the War Manpower Commission is empowered, subject to direction by the President, to employ the officers or employees of the War Manpower Commission or of any other Federal agency and to establish such additional organization and procedure as he shall deem necessary and proper."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the amendment as modified, offered by the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. KILGORE] on behalf of the Senator from Florida [Mr. PEPPER] to the amendment offered by the Senator from Colorado [Mr. JOHNSON] as a substitute for the committee substitute. The yeas and nays have been ordered, and the clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. HOLMAN (when his name was called). I have a general pair with the junior Senator from Tennessee [Mr. STEWART]. It is my understanding that if present he would vote as I shall vote. Therefore, I am at liberty to vote. I vote "nay."

Mr. McNARY (when his name was called). I have a pair with the senior

Senator from Kentucky [Mr. BARKLEY]. I am not advised how he would vote. I transfer that pair to the senior Senator from Nebraska [Mr. BUTLER], who, if present, would vote as I am about to vote. I vote "nay."

The roll call was concluded.

Mr. DAVIS. I have a general pair with the junior Senator from Kentucky [Mr. CHANDLER], who is absent on business of the Senate. I do not know how he would vote if present. I transfer my pair to the senior Senator from New Jersey [Mr. BARBOUR], and vote "nay." I am advised that the Senator from New Jersey would vote "nay," if present.

Mr. HILL. I announce that the Senator from Florida [Mr. ANDREWS], the Senator from Virginia [Mr. GLASS], and the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. McKELLAR] are absent from the Senate because of illness.

The Senator from Washington [Mr. BONE], and the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ] are out of the city on official business for the Committee on Territories and Insular Affairs.

The Senator from Kentucky [Mr. CHANDLER] and the Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY] are out of the city on official business for the Committee on Military Affairs.

The Senator from Kentucky [Mr. BARKLEY], the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. EASTLAND], the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. GREEN], the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. GUFFEY], the Senator from New York [Mr. MEAD], and the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. STEWART] are detained on important public business.

The Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. GERRY] and the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from Missouri [Mr. TRUMAN] and the Senator from Washington [Mr. WALLGREN] are absent on official business for the Special Committee to Investigate National Defense.

The Senator from New York [Mr. WAGNER] and the Senator from Montana [Mr. WHEELER] have been called to Government Departments on matters pertaining to their respective States.

I am advised that if present and voting, the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. EASTLAND], the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL], and the Senators from Tennessee [Mr. McKELLAR] and Mr. STEWART would vote "nay."

The result was announced—yeas 9, nays 66, as follows:

YEAS—9

Austin	Murdock	Thomas, Utah
Danaher	O'Mahoney	Tunnell
Kilgore	Pepper	Vandenberg

NAYS—66

Aiken	Connally	Lucas
Bailey	Davis	McCarran
Ball	Ellender	McClellan
Bankhead	Ferguson	McFarland
Bilbo	George	McNary
Bone	Gillette	Maloney
Brewster	Gurney	Maybank
Bridges	Hatch	Millikin
Brooks	Hawkes	Moore
Buck	Hayden	Nye
Burton	Hill	O'Daniel
Bushfield	Holman	Overton
Byrd	Johnson, Calif.	Radcliffe
Capper	Johnson, Colo.	Reed
Caraway	La Follette	Revercomb
Clark, Idaho	Langer	Reynolds
Clark, Mo.	Lodge	Robertson

Scrugham	Thomas, Okla.	Wherry
Shipstead	Tobey	White
Smith	Tydings	Wiley
Taft	Van Nuys	Willis
Thomas, Idaho	Walsh	Wilson

NOT VOTING—21

Andrews	Eastland	Murray
Barbour	Gerry	Russell
Barkley	Glass	Stewart
Butler	Green	Truman
Chandler	Guffey	Wagner
Chavez	McKellar	Wallgren
Downey	Mead	Wheeler

So Mr. PEPPER's amendment to the amendment of Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado in the nature of a substitute for the committee amendment was rejected.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, assuming that the substitute offered by me did not seem preferable to the pending amendment, in the opinion of the Senate, I think all of us will agree that with further study the Committee on Military Affairs, which has been holding long hearings on the whole subject of manpower, can produce something more comprehensive and complete as a solution of the problem than this highly unfair and unsatisfactory bill in its present condition. I therefore move, Mr. President, that the amendment of the Senator from Colorado in the nature of a substitute for the committee amendment be recommitted to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. The Senator knows full well that the Committee on Military Affairs reported this bill favorably, does he not?

Mr. PEPPER. That is correct, but I want the committee to have an opportunity for further consideration of the subject, and I believe it is better that that be done than to pass upon it finally here in its present form. So I move that the bill be recommitted to the committee.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, it may be appropriate to say that the Senate Committee on Military Affairs did not report the amendment which is now before the Senate as a substitute. The fact of the matter is that what transpired in the committee as well as what has transpired on the floor with respect to this substitute, is in itself an argument for the motion of the Senator from Florida to recommit the bill.

The original Bankhead proposal, introduced by the distinguished Senator from Alabama, was referred to the Committee on Military Affairs. There it was set aside by its sponsors, and a substitute was adopted in the Committee on Military Affairs by the sponsors. They were in such great doubt about the application of the proposed substitute to the problem which the country confronts that for a time they were on the point of accepting an amendment which had been proposed to deal with the matter in a different way. However, after they had agreed to report the substitute, the following day, or 2 or 3 days thereafter, they abandoned the substitute which had been recommended by a majority of 9 against 7.

Not only was that true, Mr. President, but the third substitute, having been distributed to Members of the Senate, was thereafter changed by the sponsors and the amendment offered by the Sen-

ator from Colorado, as I think he will readily acknowledge, was never passed upon at all by the Committee on Military Affairs, but represents a substitute which was presented for the first time upon the floor of the Senate by the Senator from Colorado.

I think this plain history of what transpired is in itself a very persuasive argument for the recommitment of the whole bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Florida that the bill be recommitted.

Mr. PEPPER. I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered, and the legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. HOLMAN (when his name was called). I make the same announcement I made on the previous vote, and I shall vote. I vote "nay."

Mr. MAYBANK (when his name was called). On this vote I have a pair with the junior Senator from Mississippi [Mr. EASTLAND]. I understand that if he were present he would vote "nay." I transfer that pair to the senior Senator from Virginia [Mr. GLASS], and will vote. I vote "yea."

Mr. McNARY (when his name was called). On this vote I have a pair with the senior Senator from Kentucky [Mr. BARKLEY]. I am not advised how he would vote if present. I transfer that pair to the senior Senator from Nebraska [Mr. BUTLER], who, if present, would vote as I am about to vote. I vote "nay."

The roll call was concluded.

Mr. DAVIS. I have a general pair with the junior Senator from Kentucky [Mr. CHANDLER]. I do not know how he would vote if he were present. If I were at liberty to vote, I should vote "nay."

Mr. HILL. I announce that the Senator from Florida [Mr. ANDREWS], the Senator from Virginia [Mr. GLASS], and the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. McKELLAR] are absent from the Senate because of illness.

The Senator from Washington [Mr. BONE] and the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ] are out of the city on official business for the Committee on Territories and Insular Affairs.

The Senator from Kentucky [Mr. CHANDLER] and the Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY] are out of the city on official business for the Committee on Military Affairs.

The Senator from Kentucky [Mr. BARKLEY], the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. EASTLAND], the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. GREEN], the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. GUFFEY], the Senator from New York [Mr. MEAD], and the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. STEWART] are detained on important public business.

The Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. GERRY] and the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from Missouri [Mr. TRUMAN] and the Senator from Washington [Mr. WALLGREN] are absent on official business for the Special Committee to Investigate National Defense.

The Senator from New York [Mr. WAGNER] and the Senator from Montana [Mr. WHEELER] have been called to Government departments on matters pertaining to their respective States.

I am advised that if present and voting, the Senator from Washington [Mr. BONE], the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ], the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. EASTLAND], the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL], and the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. STEWART] would vote "nay."

The Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. GERRY] is paired with the Senator from Tennessee [McKELLAR]. I am advised that if present and voting, the Senator from Rhode Island would vote "yea," and the Senator from Tennessee would vote "nay."

The result was announced—yeas 23, nays 51, as follows:

YEAS—23

Austin	Ellender	Overton
Bailey	Gurney	Pepper
Ball	Kilgore	Radcliffe
Brewster	Lodge	Tunnell
Bridges	Maloney	Tydings
Burton	Maybank	Walsh
Byrd	Murdoch	White
Danaher	O'Mahoney	

NAYS—51

Alken	Hayden	Revercomb
Bankhead	Hill	Robertson
Bilbo	Holman	Scruggam
Brooks	Johnson, Calif.	Shipstead
Buck	Johnson, Colo.	Smith
Bushfield	La Follette	Taft
Capper	Langer	Thomas, Idaho
Caraway	Lucas	Thomas, Okla.
Clark, Idaho	McCarran	Thomas, Utah
Clark, Mo.	McClellan	Tobey
Connally	McFarland	Vandenberg
Downey	McNary	Van Nuys
Ferguson	Millikin	Wherry
George	Moore	Wiley
Gillette	Nye	Willis
Hatch	O'Daniel	Wilson
Hawkes	Reed	

NOT VOTING—22

Andrews	Eastland	Russell
Barbour	Gerry	Stewart
Barkley	Glass	Truman
Bone	Green	Wagner
Butler	Guffey	Wallgren
Chandler	McKellar	Wheeler
Chavez	Mead	
Davis	Murray	

So Mr. PEPPER's motion to recommit the bill was rejected.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator will state it.

Mr. HATCH. I do not recall what the unanimous consent request agreement entered into yesterday provided. Is the Senate under its terms to vote on the bill at this time?

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The unanimous consent request agreement entered into yesterday provided that at the hour of 2:30 o'clock the Senate should vote upon the pending amendment, which is the Johnson amendment to the original committee amendment, and that debate should cease at 2:30 o'clock on all amendments.

Mr. HATCH. But not on the bill itself?

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. No; simply on the amendments to the bill.

Mr. WHERRY. Will the Chair please repeat his statement?

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The unanimous consent agreement entered into yesterday provided that all debate upon the pending amendments to the bill should cease at the hour of 2:30 o'clock, and that the Senate should then proceed to vote on all amendments to the bill. The hour of 2:30 o'clock having arrived, the question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Colorado [Mr. JOHNSON] in the nature of a substitute for the committee substitute.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered, and the legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. DAVIS (when his name was called). Making the same announcement as on the previous vote, I withhold my vote.

Mr. HOLMAN (when his name was called). I have a general pair with the junior Senator from Tennessee [Mr. STEWART]. It is my understanding that if present he would vote as I am about to vote. Therefore I am free to vote, and vote "yea."

Mr. MAYBANK (when his name was called). On this vote I have a pair with the junior Senator from Mississippi [Mr. EASTLAND]. I transfer that pair to the senior Senator from Virginia [Mr. GLASS] and will vote. I vote "nay."

Mr. McNARY (when his name was called). On this vote I have a pair with the senior Senator from Kentucky [Mr. BARKLEY]. I am not advised how he would vote if present. I transfer that pair to the senior Senator from Nebraska [Mr. BUTLER], who if present would vote as I am about to vote. I vote "yea." I wish to announce that the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. BARBOUR] would vote "yea," if present.

The roll call was concluded.

Mr. HILL. I announce that the Senator from Florida [Mr. ANDREWS], the Senator from Virginia [Mr. GLASS], and the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. McKELLAR] are absent from the Senate because of illness.

The Senator from Washington [Mr. BONE] and the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ] are out of the city on official business for the Committee on Territories and Insular Affairs.

The Senator from Kentucky [Mr. CHANDLER] and the Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY] are out of the city on official business for the Committee on Military Affairs.

The Senator from Kentucky [Mr. BARKLEY], the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. EASTLAND], the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. GREEN], the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. GUFFEY], the Senator from New York [Mr. MEAD], and the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. STEWART] are detained on important public business.

The Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. GERRY] and the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from Missouri [Mr. TRUMAN] and the Senator from Washington [Mr. WALLGREN] are absent on official business for the Special Committee to Investigate National Defense.

The Senator from New York [Mr. WAGNER] and the Senator from Montana [Mr. WHEELER] have been called to Government departments on matters pertaining to their respective States.

I am advised that if present and voting, the Senator from Washington [Mr. BONE], the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ], the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. EASTLAND], the Senators from Tennessee [Mr. McKELLAR] and Mr. STEWART], and the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL] would vote "yea."

The result was announced—yeas 51, nays 23, as follows:

YEAS—51

Alken	Hayden	Revercomb
Bankhead	Hill	Robertson
Bilbo	Holman	Scruggam
Bridges	Johnson, Calif.	Shipstead
Brooks	Johnson, Colo.	Smith
Buck	La Follette	Taft
Bushfield	Langer	Thomas, Idaho
Capper	Lucas	Thomas, Okla.
Caraway	McCarran	Thomas, Utah
Clark, Idaho	McClellan	Tobey
Clark, Mo.	McFarland	Vandenberg
Connally	McNary	Van Nuys
Downey	Millikin	Walsh
Ferguson	Moore	Wherry
George	Nye	Wiley
Gillette	O'Daniel	Willis
Hawkes	Reed	Wilson

NAYS—23

Austin	Gurney	Overton
Bailey	Hatch	Pepper
Ball	Kilgore	Radcliffe
Brewster	Lodge	Reynolds
Burton	Maloney	Tunnell
Byrd	Maybank	Tydings
Danaher	Murdoch	White
Ellender	O'Mahoney	

NOT VOTING—22

Andrews	Eastland	Russell
Barbour	Gerry	Stewart
Barkley	Glass	Truman
Bone	Green	Wagner
Butler	Guffey	Wallgren
Chandler	McKellar	Wheeler
Chavez	Mead	
Davis	Murray	

So the amendment of Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado, in the nature of a substitute for the committee amendment, was agreed to.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question now recurs on agreeing to the committee amendment as amended.

Mr. GURNEY. Mr. President, as I understand, we are now about to vote on the bill. Am I correct in my understanding that there is now an opportunity for Senators to state their views on the pending bill?

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. No debate is in order at the present time. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment as amended.

The amendment as amended was agreed to.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, I desire to take only a few minutes of the time of the Senate to explain the situation in which I find myself.

I was one of the Senators who joined with the Senator from Alabama [Mr. BANKHEAD] in the introduction of the pending bill. At that time I thought I had good and sufficient reasons for so doing. However, since the bill was introduced and since the debate which has taken place on the floor of the Senate, I have become definitely convinced that

the passage of the measure would be an error.

I shall not undertake to enumerate all my reasons for that belief. They are many. One of my reasons, Mr. President, for reaching the conclusion which I have reached is that I am convinced that the bill would put the farmers of America in a false light. I believe that it would set them apart as a special class, which the farmers of America do not want, and never have wanted. I believe that the measure would seriously cripple the war effort.

For these and many other reasons which I shall not attempt to enumerate at the present time, I shall, despite the fact that I joined with the Senator from Alabama in introducing the bill, vote against its passage.

Mr. GURNEY. Mr. President, referring particularly to one phrase in the amendment which has just been agreed to, on page 1, line 4, are the words "substantially full time on a farm." The amendment would provide that every registrant who is engaged or employed substantially full time on a farm should be deferred.

Today I received a resolution from the South Dakota Egg and Poultry Association. South Dakota is an agricultural State. The resolution was adopted by the processors of eggs, butter, and poultry, at a meeting held last Thursday, March 11.

In order to obtain food for our armed forces and our civilians, farm products not only must be grown but they must be processed and transported. I have previously stated that we are getting into such a condition that food will not be available to those who must have it. Difficulty already exists because of the introduction into the Senate of the so-called Bankhead measure. I will read from the resolution, which is very brief, and Senators may draw their own conclusions:

Be it resolved by the board of directors of the South Dakota Egg and Poultry Association, That—

Whereas a critical shortage has developed in the supply of egg cases in the South Dakota area and produce dealers have in stock only 25 percent of the supply of such cases which they had at this time a year ago; and

Whereas the production of eggs in the South Dakota area has increased 10 percent during the same period; and

This is the important part:

Whereas manufacturers of egg cases are not able to increase their production of egg cases to meet the demand because of the low ceiling price established on veneer, and also because of the present labor problems which labor problems are occasioned by the fact that workers are being called to serve in the armed forces—

I digress to say that their workers will not be deferred under the amendment just agreed to.

I continue reading:

and are leaving present employment to accept jobs in defense plants, and also some employees are making plans to accept jobs on farms because of the present farm labor deferment bill which has been introduced in the United States Senate, and, as a result of said

factors, together with the factor that such employees are not now classed as engaged in essential war industry, the manufacturers of such egg cases cannot maintain sufficient labor to produce the required number of egg cases, and specific attention is called to the fact that on account of the above-mentioned conditions South Dakota manufacturers of egg cases are running on a capacity of about 50 percent of their normal production and are not in position to increase their production, and, in fact, if the above conditions continue, may be compelled to curtail the same, which specific instance is given as illustrative, and the same condition prevails elsewhere, as is evidenced by the fact that South Dakota produce dealers have attempted to supply their additional needs from manufacturers of egg cases located in other areas, and have been unable to purchase such requirements from them.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading and was read the third time.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill having been read the third time, the question is, Shall it pass?

Mr. BANKHEAD and Mr. CLARK of Missouri asked for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered, and the legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. HOLMAN (when his name was called). Making the same announcement which I made previously, I will vote. I vote "yea."

Mr. MAYBANK (when his name was called). On this question I have a pair with the junior Senator from Mississippi [Mr. EASTLAND]. If he were present and voting he would vote "yea." If I were at liberty to vote, I should vote "nay."

Mr. McNARY (when his name was called). I have a general pair with the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. BARKLEY]. Not knowing how he would vote, I transfer the pair to the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. BUTLER], who would vote "yea," if present, and I will vote. I vote "yea."

The roll call was concluded.

Mr. DAVIS. I have a general pair with the junior Senator from Kentucky [Mr. CHANDLER] who is absent on business of the Senate. I am not advised as to how he would vote if present. I transfer that pair to the senior Senator from New Jersey [Mr. BARBOUR], and will vote. I vote "yea." The Senator from New Jersey would vote "yea" if present.

Mr. HILL. I announce that the Senator from Florida [Mr. ANDREWS], the Senator from Virginia [Mr. GLASS], and the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. McKELLAR] are absent from the Senate because of illness.

The Senator from Washington [Mr. BONE] and the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ] are out of the city on official business for the Committee on Territories and Insular Affairs.

The Senator from Kentucky [Mr. CHANDLER] and the Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY] are out of the city on official business for the Committee on Military Affairs.

The Senator from Kentucky [Mr. BARKLEY], the Senator from Mississippi

[Mr. EASTLAND], the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. GREEN], the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. GUFFEY], the Senator from New York [Mr. MEAD], and the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. STEWART] are detained on important public business.

The Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. GERRY] and the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from Missouri [Mr. TRUMAN] and the Senator from Washington [Mr. WALLGREN] are absent on official business for the Special Committee to Investigate National Defense.

The Senator from Montana [Mr. WHEELER] has been called to one of the Government departments on matters pertaining to his State.

The Senator from Idaho [Mr. CLARK] has been called from the Senate on official business. I am advised that if present and voting, he would vote "yea."

The Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL] is paired with the Senator from New York [Mr. MEAD]; the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. McKELLAR] is paired with the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. GERRY]; the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ] is paired with the Senator from Missouri [Mr. TRUMAN]; the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. STEWART] is paired with the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. GUFFEY]; and the Senator from Washington [Mr. BONE] is paired with the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. GREEN]. I am advised that if present and voting, the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL], the Senators from Tennessee [Mr. McKELLAR] and Mr. STEWART, the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ], and the Senator from Washington [Mr. BONE] would vote "yea." The Senator from New York [Mr. MEAD], the Senators from Rhode Island [Mr. GERRY] and Mr. GREEN, the Senator from Missouri [Mr. TRUMAN], and the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. GUFFEY], if present and voting, would vote "nay."

The result was announced—yeas 50, nays 24, as follows:

YEAS—50

Aiken	Hill	Robertson
Bankhead	Holman	Scruggs
Bilbo	Johnson, Calif.	Shipstead
Brooks	Johnson, Colo.	Smith
Buck	La Follette	Taft
Bushfield	Langer	Thomas, Idaho
Capper	Lucas	Thomas, Okla.
Caraway	McCarran	Thomas, Utah
Clark, Mo.	McClellan	Tobey
Connally	McFarland	Vandenberg
Davis	McNary	Van Nuys
Downey	Millikin	Walsh
Ferguson	Moore	Wherry
George	Nye	Wiley
Gillette	O'Daniel	Willis
Hawkes	Reed	Wilson
Hayden	Revercomb	

NAYS—24

Austin	Ellender	Overton
Bailey	Gurney	Pepper
Ball	Hatch	Radcliffe
Brewster	Kilgore	Reynolds
Bridges	Lodge	Tunnell
Burton	Maloney	Tydings
Byrd	Murdock	Wagner
Danaher	O'Mahoney	White

NOT VOTING—22

Andrews	Butler	Eastland
Barbour	Chandler	Gerry
Barkley	Chavez	Glass
Bone	Clark, Idaho	Green

Guffey
McKellar
Maybank
Mead

Murray
Russell
Stewart
Truman

Wallgren
Wheeler

So the bill S. 729 was passed.

**MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE—ENROLLED
BILLS SIGNED**

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Taylor, its enrolling clerk, announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the following enrolled bills, and they were signed by the Acting President pro tempore:

S. 788. An act to amend title I of Public Law No. 2, Seventy-third Congress, March 20, 1933, and the Veterans Regulations to provide for rehabilitation of disabled veterans, and for other purposes; and

H. R. 133. An act to amend and clarify certain provisions of law relating to functions of the War Shipping Administration, and for other purposes.

**CONSTRUCTION OF CERTAIN PUBLIC
WORKS FOR THE NAVY**

Mr. WALSH. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to consider Calendar No. 83, House bill 1692, to authorize the Secretary of the Navy to proceed with the construction of certain public works.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be stated by title, for the information of the Senate.

The CHIEF CLERK. A bill (H. R. 1692) to authorize the Secretary of the Navy to proceed with the construction of certain public works, and for other purposes.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Massachusetts.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider the bill (H. R. 1692) to authorize the Secretary of the Navy to proceed with the construction of certain public works, and for other purposes, which had been reported from the Committee on Naval Affairs, with an amendment.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. President, I should like to make a brief explanation. The bill is one of a series of naval public works authorization bills, beginning with the special act, the naval air base bill, approved April 25, 1939, providing for the construction of the necessary shore facilities to build, equip, repair, and maintain the ships and aircraft, and to train, recruit, and hospitalize naval and Marine Corps personnel. The increase in the number of ships, aircraft, and personnel of the Navy automatically results in an obligation to construct additional shore facilities. This bill, therefore, like previous bills, is necessary because of the steady increase in the Navy which is constantly taking place, and is in contemplation for future increase in the Navy.

If this bill is enacted, the shore facilities of the Navy will be kept in step with the growth of the Navy in ships, aircraft, and personnel.

With the Appropriation Act of May 25, 1939, which made available \$63,000,000 to provide for the beginning of an aviation base program, there has been made available to the Navy Department, in

cash and contract authorizations, a total of \$4,211,872,556 for public works, public utilities, and collateral expenses.

Of this vast amount, all but \$34,798,850 has been obligated, and this unobligated balance will be obligated by April 1, 1943.

The pending bill authorizes additional appropriations amounting to \$1,256,607,000. It is estimated that contracts amounting to approximately \$250,000,000 will be made in the fiscal year 1943 and that the remainder will be contracted for in the next fiscal year.

The bill also requires the Secretary of the Navy to report to the Senate and House Naval Affairs Committees all prospective acquisitions of land under the authority conferred by it.

The bill also provides that contracts may be entered into by negotiation, as distinguished from advertising and bidding.

Categories of projects are included in the bill. The break-down of each such category is as follows:

FLEET FACILITIES

Fleet facilities to be provided out of the Public Works fund included in this bill, \$67,900,000.

The type of facilities covered by this heading are:

(a) General expansion of fleet operating facilities: This item will permit expansion of existing facilities for serving the fleet and will provide for additional piers for berthing vessels, barracks for crews of ships operating out of the various bases, and messing facilities for such personnel.

(b) Amphibious training facilities: Large-scale expansion in amphibious training facilities is taking place. Only a short time ago there was only one amphibious training facility in operation. The number is steadily increasing.

(c) Section bases: Additional construction is required at the section bases now that local defense craft and vessels of the sea frontiers are properly serviced. Certain section bases are used for escort vessels.

(d) Emergency mooring equipment and navigation aids: Expanded mooring facilities are necessary for fleet anchorages and to provide facilities for assembling convoys.

(e) Harbor improvements in connection with fleet operating facilities, including dredging.

(f) Convoy and escort bases: Our military advances are constantly extending American lines of supply reaching over two oceans, and the development of convoy-escort bases is necessary.

(g) Motor torpedo-boat bases.

A summary of the fleet facilities and the amounts needed for same is as follows:

General expansion of fleet operating facilities.....	\$10,000,000
Amphibious training facilities.....	8,000,000
Section bases.....	5,000,000
Harbor-entrance control posts.....	900,000
Shore signal stations.....	600,000
Coastal look-out and mine watching stations.....	400,000

Motor-torpedo-boat bases.....	\$7,000,000
Emergency mooring equipment and navigational aids.....	8,000,000
Harbor improvements in connection with fleet operating facilities, including dredging.....	8,000,000
Convoy and escort bases.....	20,000,000

Total..... 67,900,000

The funds requested under this heading provide for the expansion of existing operational aviation stations, expansion of existing aviation-training stations, further development of a naval air transport service, and the expansion of lighter-than-air bases in the continental limits of the United States.

A table regarding aviation facilities is as follows:

Operating stations:	
4 new stations.....	\$18,700,000
Expansion of 72 stations.....	78,373,095
Training stations, expansion of 39 stations.....	59,876,905
Naval air transport expansion:	
1 new station.....	10,000,000
Expansion of 6 new stations.....	30,000,000
Lighter-than-air stations: 6 new stations.....	26,050,000
Total.....	223,000,000

STORAGE FACILITIES

Five million three hundred and fifty thousand dollars is required for storage facilities. It is planned that this money shall be used for the expansion of 13 existing stations.

LIQUID FUEL STORAGE FACILITIES

The total amount authorized is \$10,350,000.

Expansion of 1 fuel oil depot at an estimated cost of.....	\$7,200,000
Emergency fire protection of above-ground fuel storage at 32 existing stations at an estimated cost of.....	1,000,000
Additional aviation gasoline storage at 41 existing stations at an estimated cost of.....	2,150,000
Total.....	10,350,000

MARINE CORPS HOUSING AND TRAINING FACILITIES

Under this heading are:

- (a) Additional covered storage for 5 existing Marine Corps stations.
- (b) Housing for Women's Reserve.
- (c) Additional training facilities.

Ordnance storage facilities

Increased ammunition loading facilities at naval ammunition depots.....	\$4,950,000
One (new) naval ammunition depot.....	25,000,000
Additional road construction at naval ammunition depots.....	2,000,000
Naval torpedo firing range.....	7,000,000
Additional storage facilities at naval ammunition depots.....	5,150,000
Deperming and degaussing stations.....	2,900,000
Naval net depots.....	3,000,000
Total.....	50,000,000

PERSONNEL TRAINING AND HOUSING FACILITIES

This class of projects includes confinement space for prisoners, Women's Reserve personnel facilities, quarters for bachelor officers, receiving station and training station facilities, recreation facilities, chapels, schools, and so forth. A

table regarding personnel training and housing facilities is as follows:

Additional facilities for confinement of minor offenders at 6 existing stations at an estimated cost of.....	\$915,000
Expansion of 2 existing naval prisons at an estimated cost.....	400,000
Expansion of Women's Reserve personnel facilities, 9 locations, at an estimated cost of.....	832,000
Construction of bachelor officers' quarters at 15 existing stations at an estimated cost of.....	1,440,000
Expansion of receiving station and training facilities at 12 locations at an estimated cost of.....	14,455,000
Development of outdoor and covered recreation facilities at 22 locations of estimated cost.....	3,578,000
Construction of chapels at 16 locations at an estimated cost.....	900,000
Expansion of naval training schools at 7 locations at an estimated cost of.....	6,000,000
Expansion of preflight training facilities at 25 institutions at an estimated cost of.....	1,500,000
Expansion of facilities at colleges for advancement of the college program at 60 institutions at an estimated cost of.....	2,500,000
Development of anti-aircraft training centers at 10 locations at an estimated cost.....	500,000
Housing and technical library facilities at 1 location at estimated cost of.....	100,000
Total.....	33,120,000

The table regarding hospital facilities is as follows:

Hospital facilities

Annual repair program: General repairs and improvements at 46 locations at an estimated cost of.....	\$7,195,000
Bed facilities, construction, extension, and acquisition:	
Expansion of hospital facilities to increase bed capacity 11,000 beds on existing hospital sites at 9 locations, at an estimated cost of.....	51,960,000
One new hospital for 1,000 beds at an estimated cost of.....	4,450,000
Lease, acquisition, and development of existing facilities to be converted into hospitals for 8,000 at an estimated cost of.....	2,400,000
Total.....	66,005,000

SHORE RADIO FACILITIES

Includes the construction of two new radio stations. Total expense for these facilities, \$3,500,000.

Naval Research Laboratory

An additional research laboratory building, the same as now under construction.....	\$500,000
Warehouse.....	105,000
Utility building to provide space for station plumbers, electricians, etc., which will have to be moved out of their present quarters in the shops building.....	90,000
Additional space at Chesapeake Bay annex, either in the form of a small laboratory or storage building, depending upon the trend of the development.....	55,000
Total.....	750,000

Miscellaneous structures

Miscellaneous structures..... \$33,000,000

The extensions and improvements contemplated under this item are as follows:

Construction of new, and improvements and extensions to existing water-supply systems.....	\$7,500,000
Improvement and extension of sewage-disposal systems and sanitary facilities.....	1,500,000
Malaria control at various locations where considered necessary.....	1,000,000
Shore communication cables and equipment.....	1,000,000
Improvement of power supplies.....	5,000,000
Improvement of distributing systems.....	4,000,000
Conversion of fuel-oil burning facilities.....	5,000,000
Miscellaneous and unforeseen structures and facilities.....	8,000,000
Total.....	33,000,000

PASSIVE DEFENSE

This item is for \$15,000,000, and provides for the continuation of the program of passive defense, including camouflage, black-out, security, and other like facilities.

ADVANCE BASES

This is the largest item of all in this bill. It is for \$720,000,000. This fund is necessary to continue the advance-base construction, and the purchase of supplies and equipment for overseas operations. It involves work of a strictly confidential nature, the details of which cannot be made public.

Mr. President, I repeat that a bill similar to this is annually presented for the approval of Congress by the Navy Department. It deals with the plans which the Navy has made for the expansion, enlargement, and extension of its shore facilities, due, as I have said, to the fact that as the number of naval vessels increases, as the number of aircraft increases there must be a corresponding increase in the hospitalization facilities, in buildings and barracks for housing the enlisted personnel, and in new bases and other facilities.

Mr. DANAHER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from Massachusetts yield to the Senator from Connecticut?

Mr. WALSH. I yield.

Mr. DANAHER. Calling the Senator's attention to lines 9 to 13, inclusive, on page 2 of the bill, one finds a very interesting provision:

Provided, That the approximate cost indicated for each of the classes of projects enumerated above may, in the discretion of the Secretary of the Navy, be varied upward or downward but the total cost shall not exceed \$1,256,607,000.

I assume that some official of the Navy Department came before the Committee on Naval Affairs and purported to justify these items?

Mr. WALSH. That is true.

Mr. DANAHER. In the course of explaining the need for the individual items, did he submit only estimates of the intended cost?

Mr. WALSH. Yes, sir; largely estimates.

Mr. DANAHER. He did not submit exact figures, then, for the respective facilities to be constructed?

Mr. WALSH. My judgment is that a number of the officers of the Navy gather together all the proposals and recommendations from various district officers of the Navy throughout the country, decide what they believe is essential for public works during the next fiscal year, make the best estimate they can of the amount required, and ask for the authorization of that amount. Of course when they come before the Committee on Appropriations, under the authorization, they are expected to present their plans and a more definite and accurate estimate of what the cost will be.

Mr. DANAHER. But in any case whoever represented the Navy convinced the committee that there should be language in the bill to authorize an "upward or a downward" revision of the projects by class?

Mr. WALSH. Such a provision is in nearly every naval authorization bill, and it is requested by the Navy Department because of their conviction that, after they start on projects, the cost may increase or decrease, that there may be need of additional money for a particular project, and they want the authority to divert money from one project to another, with the permission of the Appropriations Committee.

Mr. DANAHER. Was the committee given any figures at all to indicate the amount recaptured by the Navy under the renegotiation of contracts provision?

Mr. WALSH. I have no recent information along that line.

Mr. DANAHER. I saw reported in the press 2 or 3 weeks ago a release, which, I take it, came from the Navy Department, to the effect that about \$1,000,000,000 has already been saved under the renegotiation of contracts program. Does the Senator have any figures along that line?

Mr. WALSH. I have the earlier figures, but I have not had the figures for recent months. My impression, however, is that that amount must include sums saved under renegotiation made by the War Department as well as by the Navy Department. I am surprised to learn that any such figure as that has been returned to the Navy through the renegotiation of contracts, but I know that the Navy has saved hundreds of millions of dollars.

Mr. DANAHER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. WALSH. Certainly.

Mr. DANAHER. Of course, I want the Senator to understand that I do not assert as a fact that there has been any such sum as a billion dollars recaptured by the Navy, but I remember that I saw in the press a report to the effect that about a billion dollars had been withheld from contractors under the renegotiation program.

Mr. WALSH. I think that is an approximately accurate statement of the total amount of money that has been

recaptured under the renegotiation of contracts provision both by the Army and the Navy.

Mr. DANAHER. Is it the Senator's understanding that any part of the funds so recaptured under the renegotiation provision might be available to meet the cost of the appropriations authorized in this bill?

Mr. WALSH. The Senator will recall the discussion on this subject previously—

Mr. DANAHER. I do.

Mr. WALSH. As I understand, the money recaptured does not go into the Public Treasury but is returned to the Navy Department and is included in the reduction of the cost of a particular project by the Navy Department, and money thus returned is available to them for certain expenditure by them in the same category for which the money was authorized by the Committee on Appropriations. In other words, if there is a contract made for the building of a certain number of destroyers and there is a substantial sum of money recaptured, the money recaptured becomes available to the Navy Department to build, if it has authority from the Committee on Appropriations, additional destroyers, without going back for an authorization from Congress.

Mr. DANAHER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. WALSH. Certainly.

Mr. DANAHER. I have used the word "recapture" with reference to the renegotiation program when, to be technically accurate, I should have referred to amounts withheld under that program which revert to the Navy for its subsequent use on additional projects or purposes for which the money was originally authorized. So I will say to the Senator if, for example, the Navy were to build miscellaneous structures, let us say, for which they estimated \$33,000,000, but, under the renegotiation provisions, they found they could build them for, let us say, \$30,000,000, then the 10 percent saved, or \$3,000,000, roughly, would still be available to the Navy under the renegotiation sections of the law for use for the building of miscellaneous structures only. Is not that so?

Mr. OVERTON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DANAHER. May I have an answer first to the question?

Mr. WALSH. As I understand, the money saved would remain in the possession of the Navy Department until the end of the fiscal year. At the end of the fiscal year the Navy Department must come before the Committee on Appropriations and ask for new appropriations, but the money which is available and not contracted for or spent is taken into account by the Committee on Appropriations in providing the new appropriations for the next fiscal year.

Mr. DANAHER. Yet, under the renegotiation section any balances withheld from a previous contract could be used only for the purpose for which the money was originally appropriated.

Mr. WALSH. That is exactly my understanding.

Mr. DANAHER. I thank the Senator.

Mr. OVERTON. Mr. President, I thought I might throw some light on the question which has been raised, because we had some testimony in the last 2 or 3 days before the Appropriations Committee on that question.

Mr. WALSH. I gladly yield to the Senator from Louisiana.

Mr. OVERTON. Where a contract has been completed and payment has been made to the contractor, refunds on negotiation revert to the Treasury; but, where payment has not been made to the contractor, it is retained by the Navy Department, simply because the Navy Department has not expended it. It is just as if it had negotiated in the beginning for a lesser price. Therefore, where there is a reduction of price as a result of renegotiation before any payment is made, the amount represented by the reduction remains available to the Navy Department.

Mr. WALSH. It is just as if the original contract was the amount the Navy Department had to pay, and the Department had a credit for what it was to receive under renegotiation. Is not that correct?

Mr. OVERTON. Yes.

Mr. WALSH. In other words, the Navy charges itself not with the contract that it made and from which it has been enabled to have money returned to it through renegotiation, but the Navy charges itself with the amount of the contract as originally drawn, with the deductions which have come through renegotiation?

Mr. OVERTON. That is correct.

I think the Senator from Connecticut wanted to know how much has been recaptured.

Mr. DANAHER. I should have said "withheld" rather than "recaptured," though I did use the word "recaptured."

Mr. OVERTON. The total saving in process now is \$934,000,000. Of that amount \$253,000,000 will be in the form of refunds—that is, cash paid back to the Government; \$531,000,000 will be reductions in the price of goods and munitions already ordered, and \$150,000,000 will be voluntary reductions in the form of decreases in prices or reductions in profit by the contractor, making a total of \$934,000,000.

Mr. DANAHER. I thank the Senator.

Mr. AUSTIN. Mr. President, I should like to ask the chairman of the Committee on Naval Affairs a question.

Mr. WALSH. I yield.

Mr. AUSTIN. We are now making special studies in the Military Affairs Committee relating to manpower, and I should like to ask the Senator whether the activities represented by this authorization would involve the employment of men and women as civilians working for the Navy in addition to the number who have been estimated as necessary for the year 1943?

Mr. WALSH. Somewhat, undoubtedly; but the contracts which were made a year ago are maturing all the time, and the labor involved in carrying out those contracts becomes available for use in performing contracts for the next

fiscal year. But undoubtedly in some particulars there will be a demand for additional labor, and particularly labor in connection with the newer projects, such as the ones referred to last, the advance bases, for which there is authorized an appropriation of \$750,000,000, which, as the Senator knows, covers the construction of bases on the other side of the Atlantic and in the Pacific. As our troops advance, as our efforts to gain control of the possessions of the enemy go forward, as we succeed, advance bases must be built at once, and it is a very extensive and very expensive and a very hazardous job. Incidentally, many people believe that some of the best work that has been done during the war has been done by former civilians who are mechanics, and who are known as the construction battalions, who have, almost under fire of the enemy, constructed the air bases and the harbor facilities which were needed to carry on a military objective.

Mr. AUSTIN. Mr. President, I have before me an estimate of the additional men who will be needed for the year 1943, that is, up to December 31, 1943, and it shows that the Navy will need 180,000, the shipyards 712,500, the manufacturing plants 200,000, shore personnel 10,000, Maritime Commission 3,215, War Shipping 782. Those will be additional men.

Mr. WALSH. What was the second item?

Mr. AUSTIN. The second item was for men in shipyards.

Mr. WALSH. Is that for the Navy or the Maritime Commission, or both?

Mr. AUSTIN. I understand that the figure includes the Maritime Commission and the Navy.

Mr. WALSH. Of course, there is a tremendous continuing expansion in shipbuilding, as the Senator knows.

Mr. AUSTIN. In any event, I think the answer the Senator gave previously covers the point.

Mr. WALSH. In other words, the provision is not altogether for new labor, it is for taking over the labor that has been employed on projects during the past year.

Mr. AUSTIN. It is estimated that there will be returned to unemployment at least a million men who were last year engaged in construction work.

Mr. WALSH. That surprises me. In other words, we have reached the peak of new construction for military purposes?

Mr. AUSTIN. That is correct.

Mr. WALSH. And from now on there will be a gradual decline?

Mr. AUSTIN. Yes. That is one item which is often forgotten. I have heard much of discussion of the question of manpower during the past 3 weeks, but I had not previously heard that particular item alluded to.

Mr. WALSH. I have heard of reductions in the production of various kinds of ordnance because our production has been so rapid and so steady and so constant that we have reached the peak, and some of the industries which were engaged in supplementing our ordnance

production are having their forces curtailed and are closing down to a degree.

Mr. AUSTIN. This does not relate to that; it relates to building projects, plant facilities, and so forth.

Mr. WALSH. Yes; that is, new industrial plant facilities, expansion of industrial plants.

Mr. AUSTIN. Not entirely that. It includes installations for training, barracks for soldiers, and similar projects.

Mr. WALSH. That is very interesting and enlightening to me. I do not think the public generally appreciates that we have already, to a certain degree and in certain fields, reached the peak of employment and are now coming to face the problem of unemployment.

Mr. AUSTIN. It is an interesting thing for me to remember that I have received letters from unions in the Senator's State, the State of Massachusetts, whose members were during the past year engaged in some type of construction work such as pipe fitting, carpentry, and masonry, who are now idle and are wondering where they are to get jobs. They need the guidance of a government which knows where the demand is for them so that they may be intelligently placed, the right man being put in the right place.

Mr. WALSH. I appreciate the Senator's contribution to the discussion.

Mr. TUNNELL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WALSH. I yield.

Mr. TUNNELL. I was interested in the questions of the Senator from Connecticut a few minutes ago with reference to renegotiation and withholding. I desired to inquire whether, in the mechanics of renegotiation or withholding, the two words are the same; or is the renegotiation before the withholding, or is the withholding before the renegotiation?

Mr. WALSH. Renegotiation of contracts, as I understand, can take place at any time during the life of the contract, or after the contract has been completed. If it is during the life of the contract, as I understand, the money reverts to the Navy, or to the Army, if it is an Army contract. If renegotiation takes place after the contract is completed, the renegotiated money goes into the Public Treasury. I inquire of the Senator from Louisiana if that is not his understanding.

Mr. OVERTON. That is correct.

Mr. TUNNELL. Then the amounts go direct into the Public Treasury?

Mr. WALSH. Yes.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will state the amendment of the committee.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 2, line 8, after the word "passive", it is proposed to strike out "defenses" and insert "defense."

Mr. McNARY. Mr. President, I wish to address an inquiry to the able Senator from Massachusetts, in charge of the bill. This is an authorization bill. I assume it was reported by the committee unanimously.

Mr. WALSH. The committee reported the bill unanimously, and in executive session heard at great length the various

officers of all the Navy bureaus, who explained each item in detail, and gave extended reasons as to the necessity for each item.

Mr. McNARY. I am advised that following this bill another, in the hands of the able Senator from Louisiana, will follow, namely, an appropriation bill. I am curious to know whether the appropriation bill is to cover projects authorized in the bill now known as H. R. 1692.

Mr. WALSH. I am inclined to think that some of the items may be included in the appropriation bill the Senator from Louisiana will call up. I note in the report given to us by the Navy Department that they intend to expend, under this authorization, about \$250,000,000 between now and the first of July. The other billion dollars authorized will be included in the appropriation bill for the next fiscal year. The Senator from Louisiana can better answer the question as to whether any items covered by the pending bill are included in the deficiency bill he is to present after this bill shall have been disposed of.

Mr. OVERTON. The appropriation bill on the calendar carries an appropriation of about \$239,740,400.

Mr. WALSH. Authorized by the bill we are now considering?

Mr. OVERTON. Which will be authorized by the bill which the able Senator from Massachusetts has in charge.

Mr. WALSH. The officials of the Navy Department testified before our committee that all the money which they received last year under the authorization for public works activities for the fiscal year ending July 1 would be exhausted by July 1, and that some of the money authorized in the bill before us, approximately \$239,000,000, would be appropriated this year. Is not that the fact?

Mr. OVERTON. It is my understanding that the appropriation bill the Senate will soon take up has only one relation to the bill now under consideration, that is, a contract authorization, authorized by the pending bill, of \$239,000,000, in round figures.

Mr. McNARY. What is the amount of money authorized in the bill now before the Senate?

Mr. WALSH. The amount is \$1,256,607,000. The Navy asked for \$1,500,000,000, which was cut down to the figure I have mentioned.

Mr. McNARY. When did we pass the last authorization bill, relating to the same items specified in the bill now before the Senate?

Mr. WALSH. I do not recall exactly, but approximately last August or September. We did pass a bill, which perhaps the Senator has in mind, on February 15, which became law on February 19, authorizing appropriations for the United States Navy for additional ship repair facilities and for other purposes. The Senator will recall that that bill contained an authorization for \$210,000,000, largely for the building of floating docks. That was the last bill, and was the only other bill of this nature. But that was not for shore facilities; it was for repair of ships, and for floating dock facilities.

Mr. McNARY. What proportion of the money authorized in the bill before the Senate is for shore facilities outside the United States?

Mr. WALSH. Of the \$1,256,000,000?

Mr. McNARY. Yes.

Mr. WALSH. I suppose the main and principal item of \$720,000,000, for advance bases, will all be spent outside the United States. It will be used for bases in Africa, the southern Pacific, and in Japan, when we get there. That is one of the largest items of all. I do not know any of the other items that are outside the continent of the United States.

Mr. McNARY. That is the one large item in the bill.

Mr. WALSH. Yes, it is; and the most important.

Mr. McNARY. What is the amount of money now unexpended and unobligated which might be used for this purpose?

Mr. WALSH. Mr. President, I took the trouble to review the past financial statements in regard to bills of this kind. The Navy Department officials testified that contracts amounting to approximately \$250,000,000 will be made in the fiscal year 1943, and that the remainder will be made in the next fiscal year. Of the amount of money heretofore authorized and appropriated for shore naval establishments all but \$34,798,850 had been obligated, and the unobligated balance the Navy Department said would be obligated by April 1, 1943. The Senator will recall that I set forth an enumeration of all the appropriations made since we started on this program of expenses in 1939. The total amount of authorizations for shore establishments, that is, aside from the building of naval vessels and aircraft, is \$4,211,872,556, and to that now will be added, if the pending bill becomes law, \$1,256,700,000.

Mr. McNARY. Did the full committee approve these items?

Mr. WALSH. Yes; the full committee approved them. A representative of nearly every bureau of the Navy was present and was examined.

Mr. McNARY. Have the hearings been printed?

Mr. WALSH. They have been typed, but not printed, because much of the testimony is of a confidential, secret nature.

Mr. McNARY. Is it available to the Members of the Senate?

Mr. WALSH. Yes, except the testimony with reference to the advance bases. I will say to the Senator from Oregon that the report of the committee is quite complete, and includes practically all the testimony and all the figures presented to the committee, other than those related to the \$720,000,000 for advance bases.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WALSH. I yield.

Mr. AIKEN. I should like to ask the Senator if he can tell us the amount of naval appropriations which have been allocated to the lend-lease fund since the enactment of the lend-lease law about 2 years ago? If I remember correctly, recent reports of lend-lease expenditures

show that somewhat more than \$50,000,000,000 have been unexpended, and it appears, as I recall, that between \$40,000,000,000 and \$50,000,000,000 have been allocated to lend-lease from Army and Navy appropriations. I understand that if it were not allocated, any excess appropriations to the Army and Navy remaining at the end of the fiscal year, or the 2-year period, would go back into the general fund, but when the funds are once allocated they do not go back into the general fund. I wondered why it had been found necessary to allocate such a huge sum to the lend-lease fund, where it can be expended by the Executive Office without much, if any, accounting to the Congress, and why the authorities keep allocating so many billion dollars to the lend-lease fund to be spent by the Executive Office, and then keep coming back to Congress for more appropriations. I am sorry I do not have the lend-lease report with me, but I am sure the Senator from Massachusetts will recall that that matter was brought up once before in connection with an appropriation.

Mr. WALSH. I regret very much that I cannot inform the Senator from Vermont very much about diversions to lend-lease of funds appropriated for the Navy Department. Perhaps the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. OVERTON], the chairman of the subcommittee of the Committee on Appropriations having in charge the supplemental Navy Department appropriation bill, can give us some information on that subject. I do not know of any diversion.

Mr. AIKEN. A statement about it was contained in the report of the President to the Congress on expenditures of lend-lease funds.

Mr. WALSH. Does the Senator from Vermont recall what the items were?

Mr. AIKEN. I think the September report showed about fifty-five billion or fifty-six billion dollars of unexpended funds in the lend-lease balance of which approximately \$45,000,000,000 had been allocated from Army and Navy appropriations.

Mr. WALSH. I have no knowledge of that. I can conceive of vessels and materials of the Navy being diverted to some of our allies under the lend-lease provisions of law, and I know in the bill we passed in February we included an amendment which the Senator will perhaps recall, providing that:

Hereafter any ship, boat, barge, or floating drydock of the Navy may be leased in accordance with the act approved March 11, 1941, but not otherwise disposed of, for periods not beyond the termination of the present war, but title thereto shall remain in the United States.

Mr. AIKEN. If I remember correctly the total amount which has been made available for lend-lease purposes is about \$62,000,000,000, of which some \$16,000,000,000 or \$18,000,000,000 has been directly appropriated by the Congress for that purpose, and the remainder allocated from Army and Navy appropriations.

Mr. WALSH. Does the Senator mean the money itself was allocated from

these appropriations, or material, equipment, or vessels which belonged to and in which there was title on the part of the Army and Navy?

Mr. AIKEN. I think it must be money, because, as I said, the President's report for the quarter ending last fall—September or October—showed an unexpended balance of \$54,000,000,000 or \$55,000,000,000 in the lend-lease fund, approximately \$45,000,000,000 of which had been allocated to lend-lease from Army and Navy appropriations. I wondered why.

Mr. WALSH. We ought to have that information in detail, I will say. I can understand that if the British Army wanted large amounts of certain kinds of munitions in the possession of our own Army or Navy, through the lend-lease authorities they would be able to get them.

Mr. AIKEN. But I think that expenditures for that purpose, or any vessels turned over, would be included in the amount expended rather than in the amount unexpended.

Mr. WALSH. I presume so.

Mr. AIKEN. And it has perplexed me.

Mr. WALSH. Does the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. OVERTON], who is in charge of the supplemental Navy Department appropriation bill, have any information which he can furnish the Senator from Vermont on this subject?

Mr. OVERTON. The question which the Senator from Vermont has propounded to the Senator from Massachusetts was asked in the course of the hearings on the appropriation bill which will be before the Senate in a few minutes. We were unable to obtain the answers we wanted at the time, but a statement was subsequently furnished and printed in the hearings, which will be found on page 35 of the hearings on the supplemental Navy Department appropriation bill for 1943.

Mr. WALSH. Is it a long statement?

Mr. OVERTON. It is rather long. I can give the totals. The total amount in dollars of material and service transferred is \$901,000,000. Of this, the total on requisitions through the Office of Lend-Lease Administration is \$756,920,000; on requisition direct to the Navy, \$144,140,000. That is what I understand would make the total of the lend-lease payments or contributions by the Navy.

Mr. WALSH. Are those contributions in money or in materials in the possession of the Navy?

Mr. OVERTON. They represent material and service transferred.

Mr. WALSH. That is what I assumed. And they do not represent any diversion of money appropriated?

Mr. OVERTON. No, I think not; but material and service transferred.

Mr. WALSH. Yes.

Mr. AIKEN. There would be no such amount of diversion, however, as \$50,000,000,000 or \$60,000,000,000?

Mr. WALSH. I did not mean by my last question to refer to the matter concerning which the Senator from Vermont spoke.

Mr. OVERTON. In the table to which I just referred there is another column under the heading "Approved foreign

requisitions," amounting in total to \$8,332,000,000. That figure is broken down in the table.

Mr. WALSH. I wish to say to the Senator from Vermont that I think he has opened up a subject which should engage the attention of the Senate, and I think it would be well if the Senator could obtain more detailed information.

Mr. AIKEN. We have tried to get the information. We have sent for the lend-lease report of last fall.

Mr. WALSH. Does that report give a break-down?

Mr. AIKEN. It gives the source of the lend-lease funds, and, as I have said, I think the direct appropriation by the Congress has been \$16,000,000,000 or \$18,000,000,000, and I believe \$45,000,000,000 has been allocated from Army and Navy appropriations to lend-lease.

Mr. WALSH. Is it not better to say "Army and Navy property," or "Army and Navy services," rather than "appropriations"?

Mr. AIKEN. As I recall, it is funds available. The total amounted to \$62,000,000,000—I am speaking now from memory—\$62,000,000,000 at that time, of which about \$8,000,000,000 had been spent, leaving a balance of \$54,000,000,000 unexpended. I think that is a matter which the Senate should check. If the money appropriation is not actually allocated from the Army and Navy, then we should know that this report does not mean what it says.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WALSH. I yield.

Mr. TAFT. I notice that the report states that the appropriation for advance bases, which is more than half of the appropriation, involves work of a strictly confidential nature, the details of which cannot, in the interest of national security, be made public. I wonder if the distinguished Senator can tell us the policy associated with the building of such bases. Are they being built upon land owned by the United States, or held under long-term leases, or is the money to be thrown away at the end of the war? Are the bases to be built on the property of others? I should like to know if there is any policy with regard to the expenditure of the money.

Mr. WALSH. As I understand, the bases are to be built at such places, and in such Territories or lands as the naval and military authorities believe to be essential for our military operations.

Mr. TAFT. I understand that.

Mr. WALSH. Some have already been built in the south Pacific.

Mr. TAFT. I wonder, however, if we are to receive a 90- or 100-year lease, or fee title to the property, so that after the war is over we will still own it, and if anyone else wants it he will at least have to pay us for it, or whether the bases are to be built on someone else's property and will automatically revert to the owner at the end of the war.

Mr. WALSH. Some bases have already been built and abandoned when the operation was finished. I understand most of these bases will be of a temporary nature. After we got possession of

Guadalcanal there was no need for a number of bases which were necessary during the operation. As I understand, it is a continually moving activity. I am not at liberty to state what I understand may be the naval strategy for the Pacific Ocean during the next year. However, I believe that every Senator can appreciate that the operations will be new. They will be undertaken from place to place, from possession to possession. The moment the authorities begin a military operation they have to have bases. I do not know that I can say more.

Mr. TAFT. If there is to be any salvage value at the end of the war, the United States should be entitled to it. These bases are not in effect lend-lease bases for someone else. As I understand, they are built by the United States Navy and owned by the United States Government.

Mr. WALSH. I presume that when the time comes to make peace, due consideration will be given to the fact that we have bases on foreign soil which have been used for military purposes. Either the country to which they revert will compensate us for them, or we will hold them if it is necessary in our plan for world peace.

Mr. TAFT. It seems to me that in building bases we should take a little extra care to obtain at least 99-year leases, such as we have in connection with our bases in the West Indies, or some protection which would make of them a permanent possession of the United States.

Mr. WALSH. I believe the observations of the Senator from Ohio are timely.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WALSH. I yield.

Mr. LANGER. I am very much interested in the question propounded by the junior Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN]. I do not in any way wish to hamper the war effort, but is there any objection to the pending bill going over for 3 or 4 days so that we can investigate it in connection with the lend-lease program?

Mr. WALSH. I would have to object to that. The Navy Department has been pressing me very strenuously for action upon the bill. It should be acted upon before any appropriation bill is taken up for consideration. I have received telephone messages nearly every day for a week, since the bill has been pending. I have almost reached the conclusion that when Army and Navy bills are reached we should suspend all other bills and take them up without delay.

However, the lend-lease law is something that we cannot change. Already there is authority to give materials and service by the United States Navy if our allies deem it necessary. Our allies are fighting the war with us. If our allies, or board of strategy conducting the war, desire to take a part of our Navy, they can do so. I hope the Senator will not insist upon his request.

Mr. LANGER. I do not believe it is fair to the Senate, with only a few days'

notice, to ask for a vote on a \$5,000,000,000 bill. I confess I do not know anything about it. I think Senators are entitled to be given time enough to examine into the question, regardless of what the Army and Navy want to have done. We should know whether we have \$5,000,000,000 or not.

Mr. WALSH. The Senator from Vermont has not raised the question for the purpose of opposing the bill. He is seeking information as to what the Navy is surrendering to lend-lease authorities, and what the Army is surrendering to lend-lease authorities. It is a very appropriate inquiry, but I do not think it should prevent action on a bill on which a committee of the Senate, dealing with all the questions concerning it, have unanimously reported. Every dollar which is to be spent is set forth in the report, except in connection with advance bases.

Mr. LUCAS. Will the Senator yield?

Mr. WALSH. I yield.

Mr. LUCAS. I am a member of the Naval Affairs Committee. If we should give out complete information as to what is to happen with respect to advance bases we would give all the military and naval information which the Axis Powers are seeking.

Mr. WALSH. We would declare and disclose today our strategy for next year, and to the end of the war.

Mr. LUCAS. That is correct, and that is the very reason why it should not be done. There are many military secrets which the Senate of the United States cannot know; and if the Senate is to know what the strategy of the war is to be, the Axis Powers will also know our military and naval strategy.

Mr. WALSH. That is true. I sympathize with the Senator. It is a large bill. It is painful to me to go into the pockets of American people for several billion dollars. It is part and parcel of the war effort, and we cannot hinder it. We must give and sacrifice to obtain victory. Our armed forces are increasing every day. We must have places to build hospitals, storage facilities, water supply systems, sewerage systems, and so forth. The Senate committee, composed of Democrats and Republicans, serious, conscientious Members of this body, have given time to the matter and believe that the appropriation is necessary for our war effort, and have recommended its consideration at this time.

Mr. LANGER. I realize that, but I am interested in the question of the Senator from Vermont.

Mr. WALSH. Suppose we were given all this lend-lease information. What would it have to do with the pending bill? I do not know how much has been given away under that law by the Army and the Navy. However, I know it has nothing to do with this bill.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, I do not question the necessity of the bill.

Mr. WALSH. I appreciate the Senator's statement.

Mr. AIKEN. However, I was desirous of finding out how much has been allocated from previous appropriations to lend-lease where they are out of the

reach of Congress. I have been unable to get a copy of the report of September 1942, which has those figures, which I cannot recall. I have the report of March 11 of this year, which shows that direct lend-lease appropriations have been \$18,410,000,000. Transfers authorized from other appropriations—principally the War Department—are \$35,970,000,000. Of that amount, \$3,000,000,000 is from the second supplemental Navy Department appropriation. Eight hundred million dollars is from departments other than the War Department. There is evidently \$35,970,000,000 for cash expenditures, because below that item appears another list with the value of ships which may be leased from the Maritime Commission. The amount is about \$5,000,000,000. Then it says:

Navy Department, Naval Appropriation Act, 1942 (no limitation as to amount).

It appears that \$35,970,000,000 was transferred from these appropriations to the lend-lease account. If that be so, it seems to me to be a tremendous amount to put out of the reach of Congress.

Mr. WALSH. Does the Senator understand that the lend-lease authority can demand or request anything from the Army or Navy Departments that it sees fit, and the Departments have the authority to grant it in carrying on the war?

Mr. AIKEN. That seems to be provided for.

Mr. WALSH. The items in the list represent American money that has been expended for the purpose of complying with the requests of the lend-lease authorities.

Mr. AIKEN. I repeat that I am not questioning the necessity for the appropriation.

Mr. WALSH. I understand that. However, I think the Senator must first of all understand what the lend-lease authority is. The Lend-Lease Administration has authority to go to a department of the Government and ask for what it wants, and if our authorities decide they are entitled to it they give it to them. Is there any doubt about that? I am sure there can be no doubt about it.

Mr. AIKEN. If we are spending for lend-lease at the rate of eight or nine billion dollars a year, then the appropriations to that department are sufficient to last for several years. I was merely questioning the wisdom of making appropriations so far ahead. I repeat that I am not questioning the necessity for the passage of the bill, but I thought it would be a good time to get information if possible.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WALSH. I yield.

Mr. LUCAS. I desire to make one observation with respect to the question raised by the Senator from Ohio a moment ago in connection with advance bases.

I can understand that perhaps in certain areas it might be advisable and perhaps time would be sufficient in which to do what the Senator has suggested. However, I cite the cases of Guadalcanal and Henderson Field. If we are to be

required to negotiate for 30 or 60 days for an advance base, we might as well forget about building any type of defense in the Pacific Ocean.

Mr. WALSH. The sites for advance bases are frequently taken by force. Our forces are going to invade those countries and lands and establish bases against the opposition of the enemy and in the face of their fire.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, the Senator is absolutely correct; and it seems to me to be foolish to talk about negotiating with some country with respect to advance bases when we are in this world catastrophe, when the world is on fire, and we are in the center of the conflagration. Perhaps there may be some bases away from an active zone of fighting as to which the situation might demand or require negotiations or something of the kind referred to; but certainly in the Pacific Ocean—and I do not know where all the advance bases are going to be—

Mr. WALSH. If we told where they are going to be we would be disclosing the whole strategy of the war.

Mr. LUCAS. That is correct. We know that a number of them are in the Pacific Ocean. Ultimately we must take the offensive, in fact, we are now on the offensive. Every time we make a move toward Japan we must establish an advance base; indeed, we must do so beforehand, as the Senator from Massachusetts has so well stated. Before we go into a place and take it and establish a base, we do not have time to talk about negotiating with someone.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, if the Senator will yield, let me say that of course what the Senator from Illinois has said is perfectly true with respect to some types of bases; but we are to spend \$720,000,000 for advance bases. Under that program there probably will be some bases costing \$100,000,000. Certainly, if we are going to make contracts to spend \$100,000,000 for a base in Ceylon for an operation against Burma, we can spend a little extra time in obtaining a lease or conveyance of the property on which we are going to spend the \$100,000,000. We did not spend \$100,000,000 in the course of a naval offensive on Guadalcanal, for instance. I do not suppose the total expenditures there amount to \$5,000,000. But when we make expenditures of this character it seems to me that we may well take the trouble to see that what we build is permanently protected under our ownership.

If I remember correctly, I think the distinguished senior Senator from Massachusetts referred to Africa when he first spoke of the bases. If we were going to establish a naval base in French North Africa—not a base of the kind that is built when forces are on the offensive, but, for instance, a base at a place like Casablanca—I think that any conservative businessman would see to it that he was building the base on our property or on property we had leased.

I assume that is the policy, as a matter of fact. Certainly it seems to me it should be the policy, if it is not. After the last war we had considerable difficulty in France when we came to try to realize on some of the things we had

built there; and what we got for them did not amount to 2 cents, as compared to what we had spent on them.

When we appropriate \$720,000,000, I think the policy should be to see that our investment is adequately protected, so far as it can be, so that its value or salvage value, if there is any after the war is over, will be returned to the American people.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. President, the junior Senator from Louisiana reminds me—and I want this matter presented for the information of the Senator from Illinois and also that of the Senator from Ohio—that most of the advance bases will be of a temporary nature, and after the job of taking care of the military activities is finished, they will be abandoned. Does the Senator recall that testimony—that they are not to be of a permanent character?

Mr. LUCAS. I think the Senator is correct in that respect.

In answer to the Senator from Ohio, let me say that I do not altogether disagree with the premise on which he has proceeded, but I do say with all the seriousness which I possess, that we are in a war in which our liberties and all we have or ever expect to have are threatened by aggressor nations. Of course there are times when in the Senate we quibble about perhaps a small matter that will not mean very much one way or the other in the final analysis; but what we are attempting to do, and the one real objective toward which all of us should look—and I know that all Members of the Senate do so—is the winning of the war. The question of 99-year leases, which I have constantly heard mentioned on the floor of the Senate, will not mean anything 99 years or even 6 years from now unless we are absolutely successful and victorious in the great struggle in which we are all at present engaged.

I am not one who is going to quibble much about attempting to negotiate leases with other governments in connection with the spending of \$720,000,000 on advance bases.

"Advance bases" means exactly what the words imply. They are not bases back of the fighting line; they are advance bases. When our forces are advancing they do not take much time to confer with our allies as to whether or not we are going to have some sort of a vested right in the particular \$30,000,000 or \$50,000,000 we are spending in order to build a base in a proper spot from which to overtake the enemy. Overtaking the enemy at that particular point, just as we did at Guadalcanal, at the proper time and proper moment may save the lives of thousands upon thousands of American boys, and ultimately may save the liberty of the American people.

Mr. President, sometimes I think that the war is so far away from the American people that I wonder, when I listen to arguments on street corners and arguments in the corridors of the Senate and the House, whether the Senate itself, and, sometimes, the Congress itself does not talk too much and too long about the little details, and not enough about the really big things that are involved.

I do not say that by way of any criticism at all, Mr. President; I merely feel that way deep down in my heart, because I honestly believe that America still is in danger, that the war is going to be a long, long one, and that in the final analysis practically all the resources, all the patriotism, and all the wealth of America must be expended if we are to win the struggle in which we are at present engaged.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. President, I appreciate the force of the observation made by the Senator from Illinois. There is not much more to say, except that, while we all agree with the sentiments expressed by the very able Senator from Illinois, and who of course is a very valuable member of the Committee on Naval Affairs, I think that many of the questions which have been asked—and I welcome them, and I am glad to have had them presented—indicate that, although we are all heart and soul striving to win the war, we must not overlook the duty which rests upon us not to make it cost any more than necessary, and to be cautious and careful in seeing that whatever rights the American people possess shall be preserved, protected, and defended.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MAYBANK in the chair). Does the Senator from Massachusetts yield to the Senator from Illinois?

Mr. WALSH. I yield.

Mr. LUCAS. I do not disagree with the Senator on that premise at all.

Mr. WALSH. I know the Senator does not.

Mr. LUCAS. As I recall, the committee cut down the original request approximately \$250,000,000.

Mr. WALSH. Yes; the House committee did.

Mr. DANAHER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WALSH. I yield.

Mr. DANAHER. A few minutes ago the Senator from Massachusetts picked up a bill which the Congress passed in February of this year and read the section which appeared at the close of the measure. As I recall the section, it could be paraphrased to read that, under the terms of the language, the lend-lease law and any other law on the statute books notwithstanding, we would be authorized to transfer naval vessels to any Allied power—or words to that effect. Is that correct?

Mr. WALSH. Yes. The bill dealt with the construction of floating drydocks.

Mr. DANAHER. Yes.

Mr. WALSH. That is a new departure for the Navy. We have a few floating drydocks already built, but we are going to build a great many more of them. They accompany the fleet. They will go into the harbors; and when injury or damage occurs to a naval vessel, the vessel will be put in one of the floating docks, and will be repaired right there. We shall build some of them for our allies. It was feared that if a provision of this kind were not included, title would pass. So the language of the amendment to which the Senator has referred guaran-

tees that after the war is over there will not be any passing of title to the floating drydocks which may be harbored in ports all over the world.

Mr. DANAHER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. WALSH. I am glad to yield.

Mr. DANAHER. In 1917 a law was passed providing that no warship could be outfitted in this country and turned over to any belligerent nation. So far as I know, that law is still on the statute books. It was in no way involved in the section in the February 1943 measure to which the Senator has referred; is that correct?

Mr. WALSH. No, not at all. The Senator refers to our disposition of naval vessels when we were neutral, or were supposed to be neutral; is that correct?

Mr. DANAHER. Yes.

Mr. WALSH. That has nothing to do with the matter at all. The amendment to which I referred was proposed in order to take particular care and caution that as to our floating drydocks which will be located in the waters of all the seas, and in harbors everywhere, if they are used by our allies—and they can be used by them, of course, and should be used by them—the title will not pass from the Navy. That is the purpose.

Mr. DANAHER. I thank the Senator.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. President, I think we should have a vote on the pending bill now.

Mr. DANAHER. Mr. President, relating what I am about to say to the remarks with which the Senator from Massachusetts closed his presentation of the bill, I should like to say that a few days ago I found in the New London Evening Day a column written by Mr. Ray Tucker, a noted Washington correspondent whose articles are syndicated under the title "News Behind the News—Washington and National Activities in Government and Politics."

In this particular article he made reference to a letter which had been written by a friend of his whom he had not seen for many years. The friend was Mr. Arthur D. Howden Smith. Mr. Smith may be known to a good many here as the author of the volume Mr. House of Texas. As collaborator with Colonel House during the World War in many of his ventures, and as a member of the staff of the New York Evening Post from 1905 to 1918, Mr. Smith had had many opportunities to meet the world's great and near great.

It developed, from Mr. Tucker's article, that Smith had at one time been a very close acquaintance of a gentleman named Philip Kerr, who is better known to us as Lord Lothian. Further, Mr. Tucker wrote, under date of May 2, 1940:

Mr. Smith had addressed a communication to Lord Lothian.

I was so interested in what Mr. Tucker had described as the events which followed that particular letter that I am going to ask unanimous consent from the Senate that Mr. Tucker's entire piece be printed in the RECORD at this point.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Fighters: A noted New York reporter was the author of the arrangement whereby we gave Great Britain 50 destroyers in return for bases in the Atlantic littoral. His name is Arthur D. Howden Smith. He worked beside the writer 20 years ago on the old, internationalistic New York Evening Post, which was then owned and controlled by Thomas W. Lamont, of J. P. Morgan & Co.

The famous transaction was not consummated until September 3, 1940. But the following private correspondence discloses that the deal was in the making months before that date. Behind-the-scenes facts are quite illuminating, despite Pearl Harbor. On May 2, 1940, Mr. Smith sent this message to his old friend, Lord Lothian, then British Ambassador to Washington and formerly Lloyd George's secretary:

"I had the pleasure of knowing you as Philip Kerr many years ago when I was associated with the late Colonel House, whose final biography I shall publish in September. If you chance upon it, you will find it a startling, accurate forecast of what is happening. It should be of service to the Allied cause. But that is not really the occasion of this letter.

"It occurs to me that the Admiralty will have increasing need for escort vessels as warfare spreads. Our Navy has a large reserve of wartime destroyers, somewhere between 100 and 150. They are serviceable vessels and they have been adequately maintained. Forty or fifty were reconditioned for use in the neutrality patrol last fall.

"Am I taking an undue liberty, as a private citizen, if I suggest that it might be possible for the Admiralty to purchase a number of these vessels for convoy service? I see no difference between such a demonstration of 'benevolent neutrality' by the administration and the waiving of warplane contracts in the Allies' favor."

The envoy's reply to Arthur's suggestion is significant. He admits that London could use a few sub sinkers, but notes that the sale or swap would be somewhat illegal. His communication is dated May 17, 1940 (Mr. Hull did not publicize the proceedings until September 3 of that year).

"MY DEAR ARTHUR HOWDEN SMITH: Thank you for your kind letter of May 2. I well remember our previous meetings. I would dearly like, if I have the leisure, to read in September your biography of that wise man, Colonel House.

"As to your suggestion about the destroyers, it is an interesting one, and I am passing it on to our naval people.

"But you will no doubt realize that international law forbids a neutral government to sell warships to a belligerent. American airplanes—this was before the fall of France (editor's note)—are, of course, being sold to the French and British Governments by private and not by governmental firms.

"Thank you for your suggestion, and with kindest regards.

"LOTHIAN."

Before his late lordship died, the Lend-Lease Act was passed. So he got his destroyers, his planes, food, and also American buck privates. It is not generally known, but there are almost as many Yankee fighters in empire territory as there are Britishers.

Mr. DANAHER. Mr. President, I communicated with Mr. Tucker to ascertain where Mr. Smith was at the present time, and discovered that he is right here in Washington, as a member of the public-relations section of the American Red Cross. I went down to see him and asked whether by any chance he still had the

correspondence to which Mr. Tucker had referred, particularly the reply which had been sent by Lord Lothian. He loaned them to me, to the end that I might cause them to be photostated, and I hold in my hand a photostat of the original carbon copy of a letter dated May 2, 1940, from Mr. Arthur D. Howden Smith to Lord Lothian, and a photostat of the original reply, dated May 17, 1940, from Lord Lothian to Mr. Smith. I shall read them for the information of the Senate, and for their historical interest. The letter from Mr. Smith is as follows:

HOLLYWOOD, CALIF., May 2, 1940.

His Excellency the Right

Honorable the MARQUIS OF LOTHIAN,

The British Embassy, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR LORD LOTHIAN: I had the pleasure of knowing you as Philip Kerr many years ago when I was associated with the late Colonel House, whose final biography I shall publish in September. If you chance upon it, you will find it a startlingly accurate forecast of what is happening. It should be of service to the Allied cause. But that is not really the occasion of this letter.

It has occurred to me that the Admiralty will have increasing need for escort vessels as warfare spreads. Our Navy has a large reserve of wartime destroyers, somewhere between 100 and 150. They are serviceable vessels, and have been adequately maintained. Forty or fifty were reconditioned for use in the neutrality patrol last fall. Am I taking an undue liberty, as a private citizen, if I suggest that it might be possible for the Admiralty to purchase a number of these vessels for convoy service? I see no difference between such a demonstration of "benevolent neutrality" by the administration and the waiving of warplane contracts in the Allies' favor.

With assurances of deep respect and friendship, I am, dear Lord Lothian, Sincerely yours,

ARTHUR D. HOWDEN SMITH.

Mr. NYE. What is the date of that letter?

Mr. DANAHER. The date of that letter is May 2, 1940. The reply is dated May 17, 1940, and reads:

BRITISH EMBASSY,

Washington, D. C., May 17, 1940.

MY DEAR MR. HOWDEN SMITH—

Mr. WALSH. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DANAHER. I yield.

Mr. WALSH. Did Mr. Smith have any authority or any connection with the Navy at that time?

Mr. DANAHER. So far as I know Mr. Smith had no connection with the United States Navy then, nor since. As he himself said, he was writing simply as a private citizen who was deeply interested in the success of the Allied cause.

Mr. WALSH. He apparently had some knowledge about the number of destroyers, and the condition of our Navy.

Mr. DANAHER. I gather, let me say to the Senator from Massachusetts, that he had substantially accurate information not only as to the number of destroyers available, but of the fact that 40 or 50 had been reconditioned for use in the neutrality patrol the previous fall. In any event, the reply follows:

MY DEAR MR. HOWDEN SMITH: Thank you for your kind letter of May 2. I well remember our previous meetings. I would dearly like, if I have the leisure, to read in September

your biography of that wise man, Colonel House.

As to your suggestion about the destroyers, it is an interesting one and I am passing it on to our naval people. But you will no doubt realize that international law forbids a neutral government to sell warships to a belligerent. The American airplanes are, of course, being sold to the French and British Governments by private and not by governmental firms.

Thanking you for your suggestion and with kindest regards,

Yours,

LOTHIAN.

That was addressed to Mr. Arthur D. Howden Smith, 7523 Lexington Avenue, Hollywood, Calif.

After Mr. Howden Smith had permitted me to borrow the correspondence thus recited, and I had the photostats made, Mr. Smith was kind enough to autograph my photostat for me with this memento:

Having long been acquainted with Lord Lothian and being greatly interested in the success of allied arms, I wrote to the British Ambassador a letter dated May 2, 1940, retaining a carbon copy. From the British Embassy came Lord Lothian's reply under date of May 17, 1940, the original of which I still possess. Above is a photostat of the original carbon copy of my letter and the original of Lord Lothian's reply, now presented to Senator John A. Danaher with my best wishes.

ARTHUR D. HOWDEN SMITH.

Mr. President, I thought that some of my colleagues, and particularly the Senator from Massachusetts, in the light of the discussion which developed this afternoon, would be interested in this historical recollection thus prompted by Mr. Smith's correspondence with Lord Lothian.

Mr. WALSH. The Senator has not completed his narrative, has he? Did the letter from the British Embassy end the negotiations for our destroyers while we were neutral?

Mr. DANAHER. It is my recollection that the files of the New York Times and other newspapers will reveal that starting within a week or 10 days thereafter, there were hints of the impending possibility of the United States making such a transfer as that of 50 destroyers to Great Britain, and it is my recollection that during the summer and into the early fall the matter was bruited about here on the floor of the Senate and elsewhere. Ultimately the situation culminated in an opinion written by the Attorney General, in which, as I recall, the Attorney General directed, or at least suggested with mighty cogency, that Admiral Stark certify that the 50 destroyers might be termed "over-age," and therefore be subject to disposal, and thereafter a transfer was effectuated. I think that, roughly, is a sequential summary of events.

Mr. WALSH. If the Senator knows, what was the date when the destroyers were turned over?

Mr. DANAHER. I would say in September of 1940, approximately the 25th or the 26th, but I am speaking from recollection.

Mr. WALSH. How long was it after the British Ambassador said there was no authority under international law for making such a transfer?

Mr. DANAHER. I figure that to be about 4 months.

Mr. WALSH. I should like to state as a matter of record that I personally protested the transfer of our destroyers at the time. It seemed to me at the time to be a real breach of neutrality.

Mr. DANAHER. I thank the Senator.

Mr. TOBEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DANAHER. I yield.

Mr. TOBEY. The conveyance of the destroyers was made by the Executive, was it not, based on an opinion delivered by a very obliging Attorney General? Is that not correct?

Mr. DANAHER. I have no knowledge on that point, I may say to the Senator from New Hampshire. I know that there was a statute on the books in 1917, and it is still there, which forbade the transfer by the United States, while neutral, of warships to any belligerent power.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. President, I ask that action be taken on the bill at this time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment of the committee will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 2, line 8, after the word "passive," it is proposed to strike out "defenses" and insert "defense."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is still open to amendment. If there be no further amendments, the question is on the engrossment of the amendment and the third reading of the bill.

The amendment was ordered to be engrossed and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill H. R. 1692 was read the third time and passed.

SHORTAGE OF NEWSPRINT

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, in common with other Members of the Senate, I have been interesting myself in the question of the shortage of newsprint, and have just today received a letter from the editor of the Springfield Daily News, of Springfield, Mass. The letter reads as follows:

DEAR SIR: Concerning your recent letter asking for suggestions as to what might be done to improve the newsprint situation, I am enclosing a small part of one day's batch of Government propaganda that comes in our mail. None of it, as you will see, is worth anything from a newspaper's viewpoint. It is junk, and a shameful waste of paper.

Very truly yours,

THE SPRINGFIELD DAILY NEWS,
RUSSELL J. COLLINS.

Mr. President, Mr. Collins enclosed in the envelope the batch of publications which I hold in my hand, which represents just 1 day's output from the Government bureaus of things which the newspapers do not use. It may be that much of this material seems important to those who write it, and it may have a great deal of intrinsic value to certain individuals, but the fact of the matter is that the newspaper editors for whom it was issued have not been able to find any use for it.

Mr. HOLMAN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LODGE. I yield.

Mr. HOLMAN. This is, in part, what I entered in the RECORD earlier in the week from Oregon editors. In other words, from coast to coast and from Canada to Mexico this material is going out by the millions of copies.

Mr. LODGE. Exactly, and I think it is high time that expenditures of this kind were stopped.

Here is a two-page release about frozen steel. Here is a two-page release about suburbanites who are rushing to buy seeds. Here is another two-page release, and another about how glycerine is recovered from waste fat and made into war material. That is a very important subject but obviously one which the editor did not think worth publishing.

Here is one about P. D. 1-A certificates. Here is another about using fats and greases to make glycerine. Apparently they wanted to be sure that one arrived. Here is one from the United Nations Information Office, which includes information not only for the United Nations but also for the Government of the United States. It is very lengthy, and apparently none of this was used at all, although it is five pages in length, printed on both sides.

Mr. President, I mention these things merely to call attention to the fact that apparently the need for careful expenditure of public funds has not yet reached those whom it should reach, and I desire to express the hope that this concrete illustration of Government waste will result in prompt cooperative action. I do not wish to be a scold; I know that those who are working downtown are patriotic, well-meaning people, and I appeal to their common sense and to their love of country to put their house in order.

Mr. WILLIS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LODGE. I yield.

Mr. WILLIS. Does the Senator intend to have those publications inserted in the RECORD?

Mr. LODGE. They would take up a great deal of space in the RECORD which I think might be wasted.

Mr. WILLIS. Does the Senator think that if they are of interest to the people of the country they would not be of interest to the Members of Congress?

Mr. LODGE. It would waste much newsprint, I will say to the Senator from Indiana, to print all this material in the RECORD.

Mr. WILLIS. If the newspapers of the country are asked to publish it, should not the Government set an example by putting it into the RECORD? I agree with the Senator, it would be entirely useless to put it into the RECORD, but by the same token I think it is unreasonable to expect the newspapers of the country to expend, out of any of their now greatly depleted private funds, amounts required to publish material which is of no more value to their readers than it is to Members of the Congress.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, in connection with the matter referred to by the distinguished Senator from Massachusetts, I call the attention of the Senate

to an article from the Times-Herald of this morning, in which it is stated:

The Office of War Information is now preparing a series of publications to "guide" the thinking of the people of this country on international post-war problems, it was disclosed yesterday.

Plans for the next two publications call for an initial run of 350,000 copies apiece. Proposal for a Free World will be released March 28, and The Peace by Which We Fight shortly thereafter, the Office of War Information official said.

If that is anything, it is domestic propaganda, to cover a particular point of view which the Government is attempting to spread among the people. It seems to me that in the first place it is far removed from any policy the Government should be following, and, in the second place, printing these things is a serious waste of paper and manpower, because I very much doubt whether these documents which are sent out, without any demand, without any request, will really be of use, or be read in the manner in which the people read their own newspapers.

SUPPLEMENTAL NAVAL APPROPRIATIONS

Mr. OVERTON. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to consider House bill 2068, making additional appropriations for the Navy Department and the naval service for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1943, and for other purposes.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider the bill (H. R. 2068) making additional appropriations for the Navy Department and the naval service for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1943, and for other purposes, which had been reported from the Committee on Appropriations, with amendments.

Mr. OVERTON. Mr. President, I should like to take time to make a brief explanation of the appropriation bill. The bill as reported to the Senate is in the sum of \$3,851,176,119. As it passed the House the bill carried \$3,816,206,583. So the amount added by the Senate is only \$34,969,536.

The supplemental appropriations contained in this bill, plus \$449,740,400 of contract authority, are additional to the appropriations and contract authority already granted this year in the amount of \$21,273,000,000, in round figures, making the new total authorized cash and contract authority \$25,573,000,000. Last year the comparable figure was \$24,089,000,000. Therefore what we are appropriating this year corresponds approximately with the amount the Congress appropriated last year.

The supplemental appropriation bill is due to expansions in personnel and training, advance procurement of personnel, the demand for equipment and materials due to the operations of the war, and expansion of the Navy and increases in maintenance and operation.

One of the main reasons for the increase, of course, is the increase in the enlisted strength and number of officers in the Navy. The increase in enlisted strength is 450,000 and the increase in

number of officers is 27,321 over the number heretofore appropriated for.

The appropriation under "Naval Reserves" of \$43,000,000 is primarily for training expenses in connection with aviation cadets, and with the WAVES, and with the college training program, for midshipmen training, and advanced course of aviation training, such as pre-flight, primary, and intermediate.

The funds under the maintenance appropriation of the Bureau of Ships, which are \$737,000,000, are for maintenance requirements, and in part for increased cost of some items, for purchase of material, for the repairs of ships, improvement of the fighting efficiency of vessels of the fleet, and additional commissionings of vessels.

In the case of ordnance and ordnance stores, about one-third of the estimate is for ammunition and equipment for the Marine Corps. The bulk of the remainder is for antiaircraft artillery and machine guns, fire control, and radar equipment, spare breech and barrel mechanism, nets, mines, depth charges, torpedoes, and similar items which are required to carry on the war.

The sums under "Public Works" and "Repair Facilities" are to liquidate existing contract authority. Contract authority has been included in the case of Public Works in the amount of \$239,740,000 for temporary construction in sight before the close of the year, which was authorized in the bill which has just been passed by the Senate, and which has already passed the House.

Mr. McNARY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. OVERTON. I yield.

Mr. McNARY. I observe this is a deficiency appropriation bill for the Navy Department. When does the annual appropriation bill come before the Congress?

Mr. OVERTON. That will come later on in the year.

Mr. McNARY. When was the last appropriation bill passed for the Navy Department?

Mr. OVERTON. I think it was in October of last year.

Mr. McNARY. That was a deficiency bill?

Mr. OVERTON. That was the second supplemental national defense bill.

Mr. McNARY. But it was one which followed the annual appropriation bill which, as I recall, came before the Congress some time last summer?

Mr. OVERTON. There was one Navy Department appropriation bill for the fiscal year 1943, passed in February 1942, and one passed in October, to which I have just made reference.

Mr. McNARY. I understand that. I want to know how many appropriation bills we have had in the Senate from the time the annual appropriation bill came before the House and the Senate last summer?

Mr. OVERTON. I do not know that I can answer that question. We had the regular appropriation bill. Then we had the second national defense appropriation bill. That is all with the exception

of a few items in some other deficiency bill.

Mr. McNARY. What is the amount of funds now unobligated and unexpended which have heretofore been passed by the House?

Mr. OVERTON. The amount of funds unobligated and unexpended on December 31, 1942, are between \$15,000,000,000 and \$16,000,000,000. By the end of this fiscal year according to the testimony given before the Appropriations Committee we will have a billion and a half unobligated and a cash carry-over of \$14,300,000,000. My recollection is \$15,800,000,000 in round figures, of which \$1,500,000,000 will be unobligated and the remainder will be cash on hand and unexpended.

Mr. McNARY. Then the Senator answers that there is about \$16,000,000,000 now unobligated, which has heretofore been appropriated by the Congress for the use of the Navy Department?

Mr. OVERTON. That is correct.

Mr. McNARY. Is that enough of a backlog, or does the Senator desire to add the amount provided in the bill now before the Senate?

Mr. OVERTON. It is necessary to carry a very large unexpended balance in the Navy Department for two reasons. Perhaps both reasons are in reality one. The Congress has in the last 2 or 3 years adopted the policy of withholding contract authorizations from the Navy Department and prefers to make the appropriations in cash. It is necessary to make appropriations in the absence of contract authority far in advance in order to provide for certain matériel and activities of the Navy.

For example, take battleships, which require 3 or 4 years to construct. Appropriations are made and contracts are let. We must do one of two things. We must authorize contracts or appropriate the money. Otherwise the Navy Department could not enter into the contracts. I could perhaps add to the illustrations.

Mr. McNARY. I think the illustration which the Senator gives of the battleship is very inappropriate. It is very unimpressive to me. Why is any sum needed in addition to the \$16,000,000,000 unexpended and unobligated balances allowed to pile up for the Navy? In so doing does not Congress lose all opportunity carefully to watch the expenditures of funds and keep intimately in touch with the activities of the various departments? When we appropriate from time to time vast sums of money and turn them over to be expended, do we not lose control of them and give to some organization the authority to use its discretion in the expenditure of those funds? Has it ever been the practice of Congress, in times of peace or times such as the present, to give vast sums to departments to spend in the future as they please? Do they not usually come to Congress with a budget estimate, and spend the money as it is needed?

Mr. OVERTON. The appropriations are made on break-downs submitted to the Committee on Appropriations, not only in the case of the Navy Department

appropriations but in the case of appropriations for all other departments. At this particular time it is unnecessary for me to remind the able Senator from Oregon that we are in the midst of a great war, and our expenditures must be vastly increased for our Navy, as well as our Army.

Mr. McNARY. I understand.

Mr. OVERTON. The Navy Department must feel that it can enter into various contracts for the construction of ships and for ordnance. It must have inventories on hand in order to be able to equip the fighting men of the Navy at all times and have an abundance. Otherwise the time may come when it has a scarce supply of certain material on hand and cannot obtain the output quickly enough from the manufacturers. Then what is the Navy to do? Shall it wait and go before Congress with a supplemental appropriation bill appropriating the money, then enter into the contracts, and build up the stores which it ought to have in order to conduct this war? That is the reason why we make appropriations of large sums. We do so on estimates which have been submitted to the committee.

Mr. McNARY. If the Senator is satisfied with the explanation, I am not.

Mr. OVERTON. I regret that the Senator is not satisfied.

Mr. McNARY. It seems very strange to me, in view of unobligated and unexpended balances of previous appropriations in the sum of \$16,000,000,000, that we should now be faced with a bill providing for another appropriation called an emergency appropriation. What are we to do with the \$16,000,000,000 in the next 90 days?

Mr. OVERTON. We will not spend it all, of course.

Mr. McNARY. Of course not.

Mr. OVERTON. Indeed we will not.

Mr. McNARY. Why keep adding to this great accretion of funds which the taxpayers some day will have to pay? They are now sighing from the burden which is placed upon them and which they are facing this very moment. I do not understand the philosophy.

Mr. OVERTON. The Senator will recall that when we had the last bill before us, which was the regular and supplemental appropriation, the unexpended and unobligated balance amounted to more than \$21,000,000,000. I then made the same explanation to the Senate in response to the inquiry of the Senator from Oregon.

Mr. McNARY. Yes. It was just as unimpressive that day as it is today. I shall not quarrel with the Senator.

Mr. OVERTON. If the Senator could advise members of the Appropriations Committee how they can act otherwise, I think they would be very glad to receive the advice. As a member of the committee I do not know how to handle these bills otherwise, when representatives of the Navy come before us and state that they need these sums. Their requests are supported by Budget estimates, and they state that they must use the funds to construct things which will require many months, or perhaps years,

to construct. They tell us that they need to have on hand tremendous supplies of clothing, munitions, and countless other things in order that they may successfully conduct their end of this war. I do not know how we can say, "We are going to cut down the total cash appropriation in the bill from so much to so much less. Before we make any cash appropriations you must show that you have cut down your unexpended balance from \$15,000,000,000 to \$5,000,000,000, \$3,000,000,000, or \$1,000,000,000."

Mr. McNARY. Under the philosophy of the Senator from Louisiana, he abdicates his position as a member of the committee and falls in line with every suggestion made by a representative of a department. I do not profess to lecture the able Senator, but I assume that a member of a committee should exercise his own judgment with respect to the appropriations which should be made, and not merely say, "We will give you anything you ask for." I think that is a just criticism, not of the able Senator, but of some of the appropriation bills which have come before the Senate. I think we ought to use our judgment. If I were a member of the committee I think that if a man came before me representing the Navy Department and said that the Department had \$16,000,000,000 of the taxpayers' money unobligated and unexpended, I would say to him, "I think you had better wait until you reduce that amount to some reasonable sum. Then come back when you need the money and we will give you the money if you can make out a good case."

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. OVERTON. I yield.

Mr. HAYDEN. I think the Senator from Oregon misunderstood the Senator from Louisiana in what he said.

Mr. McNARY. Possibly my understanding is not so good as that of the able Senator from Arizona. If so, I should like to be corrected.

Mr. HAYDEN. The Senator said that as of July 1 a billion and a half dollars would be unobligated, not \$16,000,000,000.

Mr. McNARY. I am taking the Senator's statement. I assume that he knows what is in the bill or he would not be here supporting it.

Mr. HAYDEN. I heard the statement, and it is based on the record. I should like to read the record. I read from page 36 of the hearings. Admiral Allen started out by stating that there had already been appropriated \$64,000,000,000 for the Navy when we got into this trouble. As against that, as of the 1st of January, there was obligated a total of \$48,000,000, of which \$18,000,000 was paid for in cash and \$29,000,000 remained unliquidated, leaving an uncommitted balance on January 1 of \$12,282,316,000. Then he said:

Against which we can make contracts the last 6 months of this calendar year, and we estimate we will contract for all of this by June 30, with the exception of \$1,550,524,205.

So we are faced with carrying on with an unobligated balance as of the beginning of the fiscal year of only a billion

and a half instead of \$16,000,000,000 as the Senator first understood.

Mr. OVERTON. However, there was unobligated and unexpended a total of \$16,000,000,000.

Mr. HAYDEN. Which will be contracted for between now and the end of the year. Contracts cannot be made unless there is a prior appropriation by Congress.

Mr. McNARY. Of course, I am in the very embarrassing and awkward position of finding that two distinguished members of the committee are unable to agree on the ratio 16 to 1. [Laughter.]

Mr. HAYDEN. I beg the Senator's pardon.

Mr. McNARY. I am assuming that the able Senator, whom I know to be able—I have served with him a great many years—says that \$16,000,000,000—he says it three times—is unobligated and uncommitted.

Mr. OVERTON. Unexpended.

Mr. McNARY. Very well, unexpended.

Mr. HAYDEN. And between now and the end of the year the contracts are to be let.

Mr. McNARY. I ask the pardon of the Senator from Arizona, who always enters the Treasury of the United States with a key and with a smile. [Laughter.] Every one—there is no use in being personal in the matter—wants to have appropriated enough money to enable the Nation to carry on; but there seems to be a desire on the part of some members of the committee to report favorably as to every sum which is asked for by everyone who comes before the committee. I think that one of the most appalling things to the people of the country is the burden that is being placed on their backs; and for one—and I have said this a great many times when appropriation bills have been before the Senate—I think we should shave the appropriations carefully and should use our own independent judgment, as men of character, judgment, and position, as to the amount of money that should be expended.

Mr. President, when \$16,000,000,000 is mentioned, I remember that I was told when I was somewhat younger than I am now that the human mind cannot appreciate what a billion dollars is. Now we are told that the Treasury says that \$16,000,000,000 is lying in its vaults, for the use of the Navy Department. Then I ask, Why bring in the bill and call it a deficiency bill? That is my position.

Mr. OVERTON. Mr. President, let me interrupt the Senator. I have looked at the record—

Mr. McNARY. I assumed that the Senator was familiar with the record.

Mr. OVERTON. I find that on page 7 of the House hearings a break-down is given. I think that the figures which I shall now present to the Senate are in line with what I stated from recollection a few minutes ago. The figures are under the caption, "Summary of appropriations, authorizations, obligations, commitments, and expenditures for war, for appropriations and authorizations to December 31, 1942—July 1, 1940, through December 31, 1942, actual, with certain estimates through June 30, 1943." The

figures show that the estimated unobligated balance as of July 1, 1943, will be \$1,550,600,000. The estimated unexpended balances of appropriations and corporation commitments as of July 1, 1943, will be \$14,331,900,000.

Mr. McNARY. Mr. President, the Senator originally made his statement from data from which he had fixed in his mind. He read the report of the Senate committee, and now he has read from the House committee.

Mr. OVERTON. I am not reading from the House committee; I am reading from the House committee hearings.

Mr. McNARY. Yes. What is the amount?

Mr. OVERTON. I say that from \$15,000,000,000 to \$16,000,000,000 will be unexpended at the end of the fiscal year 1943.

Mr. McNARY. I made such a statement a moment ago, and I found disagreement with the able Senator from Arizona, who is a good fiscal Senator, and who looks with very great kindness upon appropriation bills.

The Senator's statement is that \$15,800,000,000 will be unexpended and unobligated, but still the Senator wants the bill passed; is that correct?

Mr. OVERTON. The committee authorized me to report it.

Mr. McNARY. Yes.

Mr. OVERTON. Of course, any Senator who wishes to oppose it may oppose it. I undertook to make an explanation in answer to the questions which had been propounded.

Mr. McNARY. I appreciate the very great kindness on the part of the Senator.

Mr. OVERTON. When it comes to figures, I may not always be absolutely accurate.

Mr. McNARY. I have given my statement from the point of view of one who wants to keep at as low a level as possible the amount of money which the taxpayers will be obligated to pay, consistent with the successful and vigorous prosecution of the war, and with the huge sum now available, which is almost beyond the conception of mortal mind, I do not see why Senators want to add to it money carried by the appropriation bill.

Mr. OVERTON. That is the report of the committee, and its recommendation.

Mr. DAVIS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. OVERTON. I yield.

Mr. DAVIS. On page 6 of the bill, under the title "Coast Guard," in line 19, appears the following item:

Pay and allowances, Coast Guard, \$10,600,000.

We are told that a part of that sum is to be spent for quarters for officers, and a part is to be spent for pay. I wonder why, under the heading "Pay and allowances," we could not have the amount for pay stated separately from the amount for allowances—the two amounts which make up the total of \$10,600,000?

Mr. OVERTON. We had no testimony before the Senate committee in respect to that particular item.

Mr. DAVIS. Does not the Senator think it would be wise—I simply make the suggestion—for the committee itself

to ask for particulars, and to divide those two accounts?

Mr. OVERTON. I suppose that could be done. What particular reason does the Senator assign for doing that?

Mr. DAVIS. Then we would know how much would be appropriated for pay and how much for allowances. As it is now, they are lumped together in an appropriation of \$10,600,000.

Mr. OVERTON. I suppose that information would be given in the breakdown.

Mr. DAVIS. I think the pay and allowances could be separated.

Mr. ELLENDER. The allowances are fixed under the law; are they not?

Mr. DAVIS. Yes; but we ought to know what they are.

Mr. ELLENDER. I do not know what advantage that would be.

Mr. OVERTON. I thought that possibly there was a break-down as to that; but I find there is no break-down as to how much is for pay and how much for allowances.

Mr. McNARY. Question.

Mr. OVERTON. But the allowances are fixed by law.

Mr. DAVIS. I understand that; but we should be told what the allowances are, as well as what the pay is. The pay, too, is fixed by law.

Mr. OVERTON. Mr. President, I ask that the Senate proceed to consider the amendments of the committee.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will proceed to state the amendments of the committee.

The first amendment of the Committee on Appropriations was, under the heading "Naval Establishment—Office of the Secretary, miscellaneous expenses," on page 2, line 12, after the figures "\$6,723,117", to strike out the colon and the following: "Provided, That no appropriation for the Navy Department or naval service available during the fiscal year 1943 (except funds transferred or made available to other executive agencies for use for naval purposes) shall be used after March 31, 1943, for the employment of persons for the performance of service in other than the Navy Department or elsewhere than under the Navy Department, except employees who had been employed by and performing service under the Navy Department for 3 months or more immediately prior to their detail for service elsewhere."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the heading "Bureau of Naval Personnel," on page 3, line 20, to increase the appropriation for Naval Reserve from \$40,800,000 to \$48,000,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 4, at the end of line 2, to increase the appropriation for maintenance, Bureau of Ships, from \$737,230,464 to \$765,000,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the heading "Bureau of Yards and Docks," on page 4, line 23, after the word "including," to insert "not to exceed \$5,000 for the."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the heading "Increase and replacement of naval vessels—Repair facilities, Navy," on page 6, line 2, after the figures "\$10,000,000", to insert a comma and "toward contract authorization heretofore granted, to remain available until expended, and in addition the Secretary of the Navy is hereby authorized to enter into contracts for repair facilities in the amount of not to exceed \$210,000,000, as authorized by the act of February 19, 1943, Public Law 1."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 6, after line 7, to strike out:

CONSTRUCTION OF FLOATING DRYDOCKS, NAVY
The Secretary of the Navy is authorized to enter into contracts in the amount of not to exceed \$210,000,000 for the construction of mobile floating drydocks and collateral facilities and incidental work, as authorized by the act approved February 19, 1943 (Public Law 1).

The amendment was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. That completes the amendments of the committee.

Mr. OVERTON. Mr. President, I send to the desk two amendments which I have been authorized by the committee to offer.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the first amendment offered by the Senator from Louisiana on behalf of the committee.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 2, line 21, after the word "elsewhere" and before the period it is proposed to insert the following:

Provided, That the first proviso under the heading of "Miscellaneous expenses" in title I of the Naval Appropriation Act for the fiscal year 1943 (Public Law 441, approved February 7, 1942) is hereby repealed.

Mr. McNARY. What is the reason for that amendment?

Mr. OVERTON. There is a limitation of \$5,000 on the amount the Navy can spend in the employment of any civilian personnel. The Navy Department is the only department or agency of the Government which works under such a limitation, and it finds it difficult to operate under it. It has to employ personnel whose services are at times worth much more than \$5,000. The War Department does not have the limitation.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the second amendment offered by the Senator from Louisiana on behalf of the committee.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 4, line 14, after the figures "\$494,968,000", it is proposed to insert the following:

Provided, That so much of the Naval Appropriation Act, 1943 (Public Law 411, 77th Cong.), under the heading "Pay, subsistence, and transportation of naval personnel" as reads "Provided further, That no part of this appropriation shall be available for the pay of any midshipman appointed from enlisted men of the Navy who has not served aboard a vessel of the Navy in full commission or performed equivalent service with fleet aircraft

for at least 9 months prior to admission to the Naval Academy," is amended to read as follows: "Provided further, That during the present emergency qualified enlisted men of the Navy, Naval Reserve, and Marine Corps may be appointed to the Naval Academy after such periods and under such conditions of service as may be prescribed by the Secretary of the Navy."

Mr. OVERTON. Mr. President, under existing law enlisted men of the Navy must serve 9 months on a full commissioned ship before they can make application for appointment to the Naval Academy under designation by the President or by the Secretary of the Navy. On the other hand, there is no requirement that Naval Reserves shall serve on board any ship or for any length of time, although the regulations provide, I think, that they should be in service for 9 months before they are appointed.

There are many seamen who are at sea and doing sea duty who are not on full commissioned ships, and there are a number of them who are also doing shore duty. The purpose of the amendment is to put the Naval Reserves and the regularly enlisted seamen on the same basis for selection as appointees to the Naval Academy by the President or by the Secretary of the Navy.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is open to further amendment. If there be no further amendments, the question is on the engrossment of the amendments and the third reading of the bill.

The amendments were ordered to be engrossed and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill (H. R. 2068) was read the third time and passed.

Mr. OVERTON. I move that the Senate insist upon its amendments, request a conference with the House thereon, and that the Chair appoint the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The motion was agreed to; and the Presiding Officer appointed Mr. McKellar, Mr. Glass, Mr. Hayden, Mr. Tydings, Mr. Overton, Mr. Nye, and Mr. Lodge conferees on the part of the Senate.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE—ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Taylor, its enrolling clerk, announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the following enrolled bills, and they were signed by the Acting President pro tempore:

S. 303. An act to extend the jurisdiction of naval courts martial in time of war or national emergency to certain persons outside the continental limits of the United States;

H. R. 1975. An act making appropriations to supply deficiencies in certain appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1943, and for prior fiscal years, to provide supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1943, and for other purposes;

H. R. 2023. An act to amend section 301, World War Veterans' Act, 1924, as amended, to authorize renewal of expiring 5-year level premium term policies of those in active military or naval service and certain others outside the continental limits of the United States, and for other purposes; and

H. R. 2030. An act to permit the shipment tax-free of certain tobacco products to Territories of the United States for the use of members of the military and naval forces of the United States.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

Mr. HAYDEN. I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to the consideration of executive business.

EXECUTIVE REPORT OF A COMMITTEE

Mr. BAILEY, from the Committee on Commerce, reported favorably the nomination of Rear Admiral Emory S. Land, United States Navy, retired, to be a member of the United States Maritime Commission for the term of 6 years from April 16, 1943 (reappointment).

The PRESIDING OFFICER. If there be no further reports of committees, the clerk will state the nominations on the calendar.

WAR MANPOWER COMMISSION

The legislative clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations in the War Manpower Commission.

Mr. HAYDEN. I ask that the nominations in the War Manpower Commission be confirmed en bloc.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nominations are confirmed en bloc.

POSTMASTERS

The legislative clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations of postmasters.

Mr. HAYDEN. I ask that the nominations of postmasters be confirmed en bloc.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the postmaster nominations are confirmed en bloc.

THE ARMY

The legislative clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations in the Army.

Mr. HAYDEN. I ask that the nominations in the Army be confirmed en bloc.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the Army nominations are confirmed en bloc.

That completes the calendar.

Mr. HAYDEN. I ask that the President be immediately notified of the nominations this day confirmed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the President will be notified forthwith.

RECESS TO FRIDAY

Mr. HAYDEN. As in legislative session, I move that the Senate take a recess until 12 o'clock meridian Friday next.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 4 o'clock and 51 minutes p. m.) the Senate took a recess until Friday, March 19, 1943, at 12 o'clock meridian.

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate March 17 (legislative day of March 9), 1943:

WAR MANPOWER COMMISSION APPOINTMENTS

Dr. Frank H. Sparks to be Director, Bureau of Manpower Utilization, at \$8,000 per annum, Washington office.

Lawrence B. Fenneman, to be area director, at \$6,500 per annum, Maryland area office.

Farrell Daniel Coyle, to be area director, at \$6,500 per annum, Providence area office.

Frederick R. Whitney, to be head manpower utilization consultant, at \$6,500 per annum, Boston regional office.

Frank M. Bristow, to be field supervisor, at \$5,600 per annum, Kansas City regional office.

Ramy B. Deschner, to be area director, at \$5,600 per annum, District of Columbia area office.

William J. Fitzgerald, to be area director, at \$4,600 per annum, New London area office.

Elmer K. Delp, to be senior training specialist, at \$4,600 per annum, New York regional office.

IN THE ARMY

APPOINTMENTS IN THE REGULAR ARMY

To be chaplains, with rank of first lieutenant, to rank from date of appointment

Charles Edwin Brown, Jr.

John Porter Fellows

James Clarke Griffin

John Henry Hingson

John Michael Hughes

Richard William Jungfer, Jr.

Alfred Charles Longley

Arthur Carl Piepkorn

Harold Owen Prudell

To be first lieutenant, Medical Corps, with rank from date of appointment

Charles Herman Ransom

POSTMASTERS

ALABAMA

Joseph G. Hardin, Hillsboro.

CALIFORNIA

Janet R. Carroll, Pebble Beach.

Albert C. Rist, Bradley.

ILLINOIS

Webster Hanna, Noble.

COLORADO

Ethel A. Pfost, Arapahoe.

Flora G. Hier, Castle Rock.

Loudene Humeston, Collbran.

Velma M. McNair, Kirk.

Marie E. Greenwood, Stratton.

George S. Niebuhr, Walsenburg.

CONNECTICUT

Albert F. Ricci, Stafford Springs.

IOWA

Hans E. Eiel, Buffalo Center.

Mary E. Coons, Carson.

Orange J. DeVault, Earlham.

Albert B. Mahnke, Greene.

Martha E. Radford, Hancock.

Rita A. Thomas, Keswick.

Michael R. Griebel, Lone Tree.

Rollin J. Gilchrist, Marengo.

Gertrude C. Ward, Melrose.

Pearle M. Nelson, Modale.

Rose A. Stalder, Nodaway.

Joe H. Kout, Ocheyedan.

Carroll O. Lightfoot, Onslow.

James M. Hiri, Princeton.

Clayton P. Norris, Red Oak.

Orlow L. Goodrich, Scranton.

Gladys G. Ayers, Shannon City.

KENTUCKY

Carolyn V. Ducker, Butler.

LOUISIANA

Joy Pate, Hornbeck.

Clinton C. Barron, Lillie.

Henry J. Smith, Mandeville.

Esther J. Mohr, Pearl River.

Susie L. Ristom, Starks.

Leland J. DeVany, Vinton.

Thelma M. Fleming, Westlake.

MAINE

M. Louise Miller, Waldoboro.

Alton B. Gerrish, Winter Harbor.

MARYLAND

Mary Estelle Ennis, Joppa.

MASSACHUSETTS

William Bacon, North Oxford.
William B. Barnes, Petersham.

NEW JERSEY

Bradford D. Coffey, Bayville.
Michael A. Nigro, Berkeley Heights.
S. Herminah Smith, Brigantine.
Grace V. Willard, Crosswicks.
Elizabeth Massey, Franklin.
Edward M. McIntyre, Gibbsboro.
Louis C. Parker, Gloucester City.
John B. Braun, Jr., Hightstown.
Georgia A. Barth, Landisville.
Edward J. Wagner, Marlton.
Annie Lester, Monmouth Junction.
Jeremiah B. Beaton, Mount Ephraim.
Salvatore Verde, Northvale.
Xavier H. Walter, Palmyra.
Mervil E. Haas, Riverton.
Smith Kennedy, Roseland.
Edward J. Lennon, Stone Harbor.
Ethel B. Carr, Stratford.
Lebbeus Potter, Sussex.
Anthony J. Savarese, Woodcliff Lake.

OKLAHOMA

Lloyd Barclay, Tryon.

SOUTH DAKOTA

John H. Evans, Agar.
Anna A. Dithmer, Kadoka.
Charles E. Stutenroth, Redfield.
Mary L. Gaynor, Springfield.
B. Maynard Christenson, Volin.
Gertrude M. Matteson, White Rock.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

WEDNESDAY, MARCH 17, 1943

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. James Shera Montgomery, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Heavenly Father, whose property is to have mercy and forgive sins, we pray that we may not walk in the flesh of this world. Deliver us from the deadening ministries which thrive in the realm of evil and destroy the finer faculties of the soul. Today we bow in grateful memory of Him whose life and character have lived through the years and become the inspiration to do the work of the good Samaritan in the spirit of our Master and Lord.

In the performance of our duties may we not hesitate nor consult even prudence. We pray that everything in us may generously and heroically respond to the momentous call of these times. We believe that our Republic is a providence which is shaping its fortunes and sealing its destiny. We would hallow it as our home and shrine and beseech Thee that its vision and dream of freedom may be realized in the health of all nations. Graciously remember our President, our Speaker, and the Congress. Arm them with skill, knowledge, and power. O cleanse our America, the temple of liberty; purge Thou its arteries of the poison of all selfishness and from those whose pressing feet have never apprehended the sacredness of our soil nor felt its vibrant notes ringing in their breasts. In the name of the world's Saviour. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Frazier, its legislative clerk, announced that the Senate had passed without amendment bills of the House of the following titles:

H. R. 2023. An act to amend section 301, World War Veterans' Act, 1924, as amended, to authorize renewal of expiring 5-year level premium term policies of those in active military or naval service and certain others outside the continental limits of the United States, and for other purposes; and

H. R. 2030. An act to permit the shipment tax-free of certain tobacco products to territories of the United States for the use of members of the military and naval forces of the United States.

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the amendment of the House to a bill of the Senate of the following title:

S. 303. An act to extend the jurisdiction of naval courts martial in time of war or national emergency to certain persons outside the continental limits of the United States.

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 1975) entitled "An act making appropriations to supply deficiencies in certain appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1943, and for prior fiscal years, to provide supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1943, and for other purposes."

BOARD OF VISITORS OF THE UNITED STATES MILITARY ACADEMY

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following communication:

MARCH 15, 1943.

Hon. SAM RAYBURN,

Speaker, House of Representatives.

MY DEAR MR. SPEAKER: Pursuant to the provisions of the act approved May 17, 1928 (U. S. C., title 10, sec. 1052a), I have designated Hon. J. BUELL SNYDER, Hon. JOE STARNES, Hon. JOHN H. KERR, Hon. D. LANE POWERS, and Hon. ALBERT J. ENGEL, members of the Committee on Appropriations, as members from this committee to the Board of Visitors of the United States Military Academy for the calendar year 1943.

With assurances of my regard, I am,
Sincerely yours,

CLARENCE CANNON,
Chairman, Committee on Appropriations, House of Representatives.

IRISH SALUTATIONS

Mr. O'BRIEN of New York. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. O'BRIEN of New York. Mr. Speaker, Members of the House, may I on this glorious morning, March 17, salute you as a true descendant of St. Patrick with a "Top o' the morning, a Cajamathu, and an Erin go brath"—begorra.

It is not necessary for me to tell you that I am joined in these salutations by every Member of this House of Irish extraction. It is true and as proven from generation to generation there is no nationality in the world that owes so much

to this country as the fighting Irish owe to the land of their adoption, the United States of America.

Every honest, sincere, loyal, patriotic American of Irish extraction not only on this St. Patrick's Day but on every day falls to his knees and thanks God for the opportunities he has been given. Every red-blooded, two-fisted, square-shooting, hard-hitting Irishman is willing to give his last drop of blood in defense of the ideals, traditions, precepts, policies, and free institutions that have made life so dear to him in America. Absolute proof of this statement is borne out by the Sullivan boys of Iowa and many other Irish-Americans who have made the supreme sacrifice in this war and other wars that our form of government may continue.

In greeting you this morning, you are acutely conscious of the undisputed fact that the O'Briens were the noblest of all Kings of Ireland, and on the left side of the House we have the O'Haras, the Welches, the Gavins, the Kearneys, and the Culkins, brave men all lieutenants in the great army of King O'Brien.

On the right side of the House, we greet those three well-known Irishmen from Texas, brave Milton Michael O'West, Spanish-speaking Richard the Lion-hearted O'Kleberg, and the famous fighting O'Kilday.

The Irish, as you know, are a generous race. Therefore, we salute the numerous sons of old Erin—on the majority side of the aisle such as—the Merritts, the Lynches, the Gavagans, the Cullens, the Curleys, the Fitzpatricks, the O'Tooles, the O'Learys, and the O'Connors, and being most generous we will mention the Keoghs, the Fays, the Kennedys, the Harts, the Nortons, and the Flannagans. We will not overlook the Cochranes, the Fogartys, the Maddens, the Kirwans, the Murphys, the O'Neals, the Kellys, the Delaneys. Yes, the McGranerys and the Bradleys, and we pay particular attention to that stalwart Sullivan of Nevada, who is the honorary chairman of the Five Sullivan Brothers Foundation.

Yes, last but not least, that great counterfeit Irishman, my distinguished friend, PAT CANNON, of Florida.

We have not purposely left out the O'Briens of Chicago and the O'Briens of Detroit, but please remember they are merely O'Briens and in no way associated either conspicuously or remotely with The O'Briens. We were the kings of Ireland.

There was a time when the McCormacks tried to assert themselves as leaders in good old Erin. These bog-trotting, shillelagh-flinging, banshee-howling McCormacks shouted from the housetops that they owned the Lakes of Killarney. The truth of the matter, Mr. Speaker, is these McCormacks now known as Boston Irish, did receive privileges from the O'Briens to use these beautiful Lakes of Killarney, and were told very definitely and emphatically by one of my ancestors that they could bathe and wash their clothes in these lakes. The astounding and sensational part of this confidential information to you Members of the House is that at no